



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

*Chap.* DA508

*Shelf* B8 R7

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.















AN  
INQUIRY,  
CONCERNING  
THE AUTHOR  
OF THE  
LETTERS OF JUNIUS;

IN WHICH IT IS PROVED,  
BY INTERNAL, AS WELL AS BY DIRECT AND SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE,

THAT THEY WERE WRITTEN BY THE LATE  
*RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE.*

---

BY  
JOHN ROCHE, ESQ.

HONORARY MEMBER, AND FORMERLY PRESIDENT, OF THE ROYAL PHYSICAL  
SOCIETY OF EDINBURGH, &c.

---

A mortal born, he met the general doom;  
But left, like Egypt's kings, a lasting tomb!  
DR. JOHNSON.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED BY WHITTINGHAM AND ROWLAND,  
*Goswell Street;*

FOR J. CARPENTER, OLD BOND STREET, AND J. CARR,  
56, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1813.

DA 505  
BER7



3. 2. 13 17/1/1888

TO HIS GRACE  
**THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE,**  
*&c. &c. &c.*

---

NOT wishing, my Lord, that any thing, which I write for the public, should be indebted, for any part of its success, to any thing but its own merits, it is not my intention, by inscribing the following work to your Grace, to shelter it under your protection: my object is to express, in as public a manner as I can, the high respect, which, on many accounts, I entertain for your Grace's character; but, particularly, on account of that benevolent and paternal attention to your Irish tenantry, by which you have given so worthy an example to others, and which has made your Grace's name as a landlord proverbial in that country. Junius being a true Whig, and as, I think, I have satisfactorily shewn,

an Irishman, there is no person to whom I can more properly inscribe an Essay occasioned by his writings, than to the leader of one of the first Whig families of England, particularly when that leader, as far as it lies in his power, shews himself well disposed to be a father and a friend to the ill-treated and worse-governed people of Ireland. Besides, my Lord, were these considerations altogether out of the question, I should hope, that a work so intimately connected, as the following Inquiry is, with the writings of the late Mr. Burke, could scarcely prove unacceptable to the Head of the House of Cavendish.

I have the honour to be,

my Lord,

Your Grace's most obedient

and most humble servant,

JOHN ROCHE.

SOUTHAMPTON CRESCENT,

*July 5, 1813.*



AN  
INQUIRY,  
&c.

---

VERY few questions of literary history have ever excited so much public interest and curiosity, as that, which relates to the discovery of the author of Junius. It is now pretty nearly half a century since this mysterious and able advocate of our constitutional rights began to attract the public attention, by the dignified boldness, the finished elegance, and the spirited patriotism of his political writings: and surely it must be allowed, that they ought to be possessed of no ordinary share of merit to secure, as they have done hitherto, and to command, even at this hour, the same unmixed approbation, and to excite as much curiosity as to the probable person of their author, as they are known to have done during the time of their original appearance in the Public Advertiser. That Junius was no common man, (εἴχ' ὁ τυχὼν ἀνὴρ, as Longinus said of the Legislator of the Jews), has been always ad-

mitted, even by the most abusive and virulent of his opponents. And, though some of them have endeavoured to heap almost every possible calumny upon his name, I do not recollect, that his undoubted talents and general veracity have been ever seriously questioned by any persons above the rank of low, suborned, illiterate, or obscure revilers. I was not therefore sorry to find, that the new edition of his writings had called forth the powerless virulence of one of this class: for it is one of the hereditary privileges of genius to excite the applause and the admiration of the many, as well as the abuse and malevolence of a few. And surely it cannot be discreditable to Junius, but must rather give additional pleasure to his sincere admirers, when they find his works, even at this day, possessed of sufficient merit to cause the bile of one miserable essayist to overflow. Were it not for the memorable genius of Homer, we should never have heard of the name of the miserable Zoilus: but the worthiness of his labours has secured to the father of critics no very enviable kind of immortality. The Zoilus of Junius, I fear, is not very likely to secure even this wretched species of fame with posterity. To scribble and to call names may help him to put a few pence into his pocket, or to purge himself of the spleen: but

the writings of such persons can excite nothing but pity, contempt or merriment, in the minds of men of sense. They know, that the itch for scribbling is not a disease easily cured; whilst they remember, that ignorance and envy have been always found barking at the heels of genius.

Never since their first appearance has the public attention been more fully fixed on that inquiry, the object of which is to discover the real author of those admirable letters, than it has been since the publication of the new and enlarged edition by Mr. Woodfall. We know, that it had been long anxiously wished for by the learned; and I will confess, that I was one of those who expected, for some years, from the family of Mr. Woodfall more probable conjectures as to the real author, than from any other source. Anxious, however, as I was for the new edition, and gratified by the large portion of new matter which it contains, I must own, that the pleasure, which I felt on its appearance, was at first considerably diminished, when I found, after all the exertions of the new editor, that the question concerning the real author was still left as much as ever in the dark. But, although, a disappointment of this kind was very mortifying, I was still much pleased with the mode in which the execution

of the entire work had been conducted by Mr. Woodfall. The errors which it contained were trifling, and so far it must be highly gratifying to the editor to find, that the labour, which he had undergone in its execution, had not been exerted without success. And, although, in the inquiries contained in the preliminary essay, he has not succeeded in making it probable, that any of the persons, to whom the letters have been attributed, was the real author ; still it was some consolation to find, that he had laid several new facts, documents and circumstances before the public, from which, one time or another, some satisfactory inferences might be deduced. If it was mortifying to think, that the landmarks of our knowledge on this interesting subject were still left in their old sober station ; and to find, that no progress had been made in this voyage of discovery ; that no new island or continent had been touched upon in so long and anxious a navigation ; it was still consoling to reflect, that the wide ocean of discovery was still lying open before us, however agitated or overcast.

It is now more than thirteen years since I first read the letters of Junius ; and, though but young at the time, I was so forcibly struck with their undoubted merits, that they soon became

my daily companion : so much so indeed, that there was scarcely a part of them, which I could not repeat with facility. With all my partiality for them, however, at that time, and anxious as I must have been to learn something of the writer, several years elapsed before I ventured to form any opinion concerning the person who was the real author. One opinion, indeed, I had pretty early formed, namely, that of all the persons to whom the letters had been attributed, Mr. Burke was the only man (were we to judge by the merits of the works acknowledged by each) whom I did not deem inadequate to the performance. But knowing, that the general current of opinions ran so forcibly against his claims, I had not then the courage to say, (though I was inclined to think so) that the laurels of Junius ought to adorn that solid and imperishable fabric—the monument of Burke. It is certain, however, that I was afterwards led to adopt and to acknowledge that very heterodox opinion : and the following essay will, I hope, contribute to shew that the grounds, upon which I was induced to do so, were neither frivolous, ill-founded, or visionary.

After all that has been written concerning the author of Junius, I must confess, that no publi-

cation, which I have yet seen on that subject, has given any satisfaction to my mind. The first attempt to discover the author, that came under my cognizance, after the publication of the new edition, was that of a writer in a late number of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, who has gravely condescended to inform us, that the letters were written by the late Earl of Shelburne, afterwards Marquis of Lansdowne. Now, really, though I am as well disposed, as any body else, to give to his Lordship all due praise, for the extensive political information and the abilities, which he certainly possessed, I see no reason whatever, for suspecting, even in the most remote degree, that he had any pretensions to be reputed the author of Junius. The person, who hazarded this conjecture, ought to know, at least from the contents of the new edition, that his Lordship was one of the first public characters attacked by Junius, and that, too, with no ordinary degree of severity. But so great has been the rage for conjecturing concerning Junius, that, for my part, I should not be at all surprised to hear, that the letters were one time very gravely ascribed to our venerable monarch\*, or to some other member of

\* Since writing the above I have been positively assured, that a certain noble person was in the habit of saying at the table of a Lady, who has lately made some noise, that the



the Royal Family ; or at another, to a Grafton, or a Mansfield ; or even perhaps to old Noll, or to Jerry Dyson.

There is, as I have already hinted, one insuperable objection to the claims of most of those persons, to whom they have been ascribed ; namely, that we have no reason (judging from their several works) to think any of them equal to the composition of the Letters of Junius. This objection, however, I am persuaded, will be readily allowed to have but little weight, when urged against the claims of Mr. Burke ; as it is unquestionable, that his works, taken as a whole, are far superior to those of Junius, in point of eloquence, information, and abilities. Were I to detail all my reasons for thinking, that these celebrated Letters were written by Mr. Burke, and to cite all the passages from his writings, and from those of Junius, upon which my opinion is in a great measure founded, this inquiry would form a pretty large volume. But, as my object is not to make a book, but to state pretty fully, though

K—— was the only person in Britain, who could write like Junius, and that he was considered in his own family as the author of the Letters. Thus has Junius been classed among our Royal and Noble Authors ;—a distinction to which he would certainly be well entitled, were merit always allowed to constitute the solid base of true nobility.

with as much brevity as I can, some of my reasons for being of this opinion, I mean to confine my remarks within such reasonable limits, as the nature of a pamphlet will allow.

A late writer on this subject has taken some pains to show, that Mr. Burke was not the author of Junius. This opinion he has founded on two principal reasons: first, the style of both is different; and, secondly, they differ materially in opinion, on two or three important topics. I never heard the name of Burke mentioned, as the probable writer of Junius, without hearing somebody present say, that it was impossible, as their styles were so different. This opinion, it would seem, is a sort of inalienable, hereditary property among critics of a certain description. It is adopted, in the fullest extent, by the essayist to whom I have just alluded; for he affirms, that "*Burke could not have written in the style of Junius, which was precisely the reverse of his own.*" As I am a friend to candour, I must own, that this declaration is candid, and bold enough at the least; and yet I am satisfied, that it can be proved, not only that Burke *could*, but, that he actually did often write in the manner of Junius, as I shall show from various parts of his acknowledged works. The war-cry,



the no-poperÿ-cry and the cry about the church being in danger, were never more prevalent in this country among bigots, zealots, and interested persons, than this cry about style has been among the minor critics on the subject of Junius. This, however, is not a question to be decided by mere clamour, or by the dictates of narrow-minded, or prejudiced opinion. It will not therefore be improper to remind those who think, that he *could not write* like Junius, that Burke, before he was twenty years of age, while in Dublin College, was able to imitate the style and manner of Dr. Lucas so successfully, in a series of patriotic letters, which he published in the Dublin newspapers, as to deceive both the critics and the public\*. And it is, besides,

\* "In the year 1749, Lucas, a demagogue apothecary, wrote a number of very daring papers against government, and acquired as great popularity in Dublin, as Mr. Wilkes afterwards did in London. Burke, whose principal attention had been directed to more important objects, than the Categories of Aristotle, perceived the noxious tendency of levelling doctrines. He wrote several essays in the style of Lucas, imitating it so completely, as to deceive the public: pursuing the principles of Lucas to consequences obviously resulting from them, and, at the same time, shewing their absurdity and danger. The first literary effort of his mind was an exposure of the absurdity of democratical innovations. This was the *Ticinus* of our political *Scipio*." (Bisset's Life of Burke). It is not a little remarkable, that his first, as well as most of his latest political works, were written in defence of our establishments, and to repress too daring a

well known, that his *Vindication of Natural Society*, one of the most admirable counterfeits ever given to the public, passed, as he intended it to do, for a posthumous work of the celebrated Lord Bolingbroke \*.

That he could also write in the manner of Junius will not, I think, be denied by *good judges*, when they consider attentively, and com-

spirit of innovation: but Burke, being a friend to rational and practical, not to speculative, or theoretical liberty, was at all times equally ready to defend it, whether invaded by kingly prerogative, or parliamentary privilege, by the insolent spirit of aristocratic domination, or the wild and seditious turbulence of popular licentiousness.

\* Since writing the above I have met with the following character of the *Vindication of Natural Society*. It is so just and so spirited, that I am sure it cannot be disagreeable to the reader. "In Burke's imitation of Bolingbroke (*the most perfect specimen, perhaps, which ever will exist of the art of which we are speaking*), we have all the qualities, which distinguish the style, or we may, indeed, say the genius, of that noble writer, as it were concentrated and brought at once before us; so that an ordinary reader, who, in perusing his genuine works, merely felt himself dazzled and disappointed, delighted and wearied he could not tell why, is now enabled to form a definite and precise conception of the causes of those opposite sensations; and to trace to the nobleness of the diction and the inaccuracy of the reasoning—the boldness of the propositions and the rashness of the inductions—the magnificence of the pretensions and the feebleness of the performance, those contradictory judgments, with the confused result of which he had been perplexed in his study of the original."

pare with the style of that writer, some of the passages quoted from Burke's works in a subsequent part of this inquiry. Before I proceed, however, to the citation of these, it will not be irrelevant to premise one or two observations.

Few, I am persuaded, will be disposed to contradict me, when I say, that so great was Mr. Burke's original fund of thinking, as well as his acknowledged command of language and elegance of style, that it was altogether unnecessary for him to borrow the thoughts of others, or to imitate their style or manner of writing, either with a view of improving his own, or for the purpose of bestowing upon them much additional perfection, or decoration. If, therefore, we find him often, and obviously, writing in the manner, which it has been fashionable among some critics to suppose peculiar to Junius, must we not naturally conclude, that this mode of writing became so familiar to him from habit, and from the labour which it cost him to acquire it, that he has often slid into it imperceptibly, even in those works which he has acknowledged as his own? And we know that Junius bestowed great labour on the composition of his letters, from his own confession, in his reply to Mr. Horne; but more fully from the recent publi-

cation of his private correspondence with Mr. Woodfall and Mr. Wilkes.

The second observation, which I wish to premise, is equally clear and indisputable ; namely, that the style of this writer, under the various other signatures, which he from time to time assumed, is frequently as different from that of Junius, as the style of Junius is from that of Mr. Burke. This, at least, I persuade myself, will appear evident to any scholar, who reads the miscellaneous letters in the new edition, with as much attention and impartiality as I have done.

It was not until the year 1808 that I began to suspect very strongly, that Junius was written by Mr. Burke. Having before that time so frequently read the letters as to be intimately acquainted with every part of them, I was readily able to recognize any thing like the style, or manner of Junius, whenever it occurred. Happening, in that year, to be in a remote part of the country, where I had not many books, I was induced to read some of Mr. Burke's works with great attention, and was not a little surprised to find, in various parts of them, passages written in the exact style and manner of Junius. Upon making this discovery, I was led to read and to examine

the works of both with greater attention ; the result of which, upon my mind, was as strong a conviction as can be conveyed to the mind of a scholar, by that species of evidence, that Mr. Burke was the author of Junius. I accordingly avowed that opinion at the time, as it has been customary with me to do ever since,—not indeed as unquestionable, but as, in the highest degree, probable.

Such being my opinion upon the subject, it was natural for me to be anxious for the publication of the edition so long expected from Mr. Woodfall ; and, accordingly, I took it up, shortly after its appearance, with a view of ascertaining, whether the new matter, which it contained, was likely to throw any additional light upon the subject, so as either to confirm me in the opinion which I had been induced to adopt, or to lead me to reject it, as ill-founded or improbable. I had not, however, been long engaged in this research, when I found my opinion more strongly confirmed, than it was possible for me to have expected. When the reader hears them, he will be able to judge of the weight of my reasons. But as the alleged difference of his style is the greatest argument against Mr.

Burke's claims, to that point I shall first direct my attention.

With this view I may be permitted to put one question, not, indeed, to those critics, who are confident that Mr. Burke *could not write* in the style of Junius, but to scholars of taste and discernment, who know how to form a proper estimate of those peculiarities, which are deemed to constitute identity or diversity of style; *and to whom alone I would be understood to address myself in most parts of this inquiry*\*. The question, and a simple one, is, whether they can, or indeed, whether any body can point out, in all the writings of Junius, *a single passage*, which has more of the peculiarities of his manner and style, than the following extract taken from the works of Mr. Burke? "Nobody, I believe, will consider it merely as the language of spleen, or disappointment, if I say, that there is something parti-

\* Those readers, who take up a book merely for amusement, or for the equally important purpose of killing time, must not blame me, if they are disappointed, as I have given them fair warning. In this long Inquiry I do not once draw upon the reader's fancy or my own; my object being to satisfy the judgment, not to please the imagination. That, and that only, being my object, if I do not succeed so far, I lose my aim.



cularly alarming in the present conjuncture. There is hardly a man in or out of power, who holds any other language. That government is at once dreaded and contemned; that the laws are despoiled of all their respected and salutary terrors; that their inaction is a subject of ridicule, and their exertion of abhorrence; that rank, and office, and title, and all the solemn plausibilities of the world have lost their reverence and effect; that our foreign politics are as much deranged as our domestic economy; that our dependencies are slackened in their affection and loosened from their obedience; that we know neither how to yield, nor how to enforce; that hardly any thing above or below, abroad or at home, is sound and entire; but that disconnection and confusion in office, in parties, in families, in parliament, in the nation, prevail beyond the disorders of any former time:—These are facts universally admitted and lamented.” (*Thoughts on the Cause of the present Discontents.*)

The latter part also of the following extract from the same tract, where he is speaking of the House of Commons, is very like the style of Junius:—“ The virtue, spirit, and essence of a House of Commons consist in its being the

express image of the feelings of the nation. It was not instituted to be a controul *upon the people*, as of late it has been taught by a doctrine of the most pernicious tendency: it was designed as a controul *for the people*\*." \*\*\* "A vigilant and jealous eye over executory and judicial magistracy; an anxious care of public money; an openness approaching towards facility to public complaint; these seem to be the true characteristics of an House of Commons †. But an addressing House of Commons, and a petitioning nation; an House of Commons full of confidence, when the nation is plunged in despair; in the utmost harmony with ministers, whom the people regard with the utmost abhorrence; who vote thanks when the public opinion calls upon them for impeachments; who are eager to grant, when the general voice demands account; who, in all disputes, between the people

\* Junius says, in the same spirit:—"The House of Commons are only interpreters, whose duty it is to convey the sense of the people faithfully to the crown. If the interpretation be false, or imperfect, the constituent powers are called upon to deliver their own sentiments."—(Vol. ii. p. 134).

† "The constitutional duties of the House of Commons," says Junius, "are not very complicated, or mysterious: they are to propose or assent to wholesome laws for the benefit of the nation; they are to grant the necessary aids to the king; to petition for the redress of grievances, and prosecute treason, or high crimes against the state." (Vol. ii. p. 213).



and administration, presume against the people ; who punish their disorders, but refuse even to inquire into the provocations to them ; this is an unnatural, a monstrous state of things in this constitution. Such an assembly may be a great, wise, awful senate ; but it is not, to any popular purpose, an House of Commons.”

Even the first paragraph of this able performance has much of the manner of Junius :—“ It is an undertaking of some degree of delicacy to examine into the cause of public disorders. If a man happens not to succeed in such an inquiry, he will be thought weak and visionary ; if he touches the true grievance, there is a danger, that he may come near to persons of weight and consequence, who will rather be exasperated at the discovery of their errors, than thankful for the occasion of correcting them. If he should be obliged to blame the favourites of the people, he will be considered as the tool of power ; if he censures those in power, he will be looked on as an instrument of faction. But in all exertions of duty something is to be hazarded. In cases of tumult and disorder, our law has invested every man, in some sort, with the authority of a magistrate. When the affairs of the nation are distracted, private people are, by

the spirit of that law, justified in stepping a little out of their ordinary sphere. They enjoy a privilege of somewhat more dignity and effect, than that of idle lamentation over the calamities of their country. They may look into them narrowly; they may reason upon them liberally; and, if they should be so fortunate as to discover the true source of the mischief, and to suggest any probable method of removing it, though they may displease the rulers for the day, they are certainly of service to the cause of government.”—\*\*\*—“ Nations are governed by the same methods, and on the same principles, by which an individual, without authority, is often able to govern those, who are his equals, or his superiors; by a knowledge of their temper, and a judicious management of it; I mean, whenever public affairs are steadily and quietly conducted; not when government is nothing but a continued scuffle between the magistrate and the multitude; in which, sometimes the one and sometimes the other is uppermost; in which they alternately yield and prevail, in a series of contemptible victories and scandalous submissions. The temper of the people, amongst whom he presides, ought therefore to be the first study of a statesman; and the knowledge of this temper it is by no means impossible for

him to attain, if he has not an interest in being ignorant of what it is his duty to learn." A little farther on he remarks:—"This state of things is the more extraordinary, because the great parties which formerly divided and agitated the kingdom, are known to be, in a manner, entirely dissolved. No great external calamity has visited the nation; no pestilence or famine. We do not labour at present under any scheme of taxation new or oppressive, in the quantity, or in the mode. Nor are we engaged in unsuccessful war; in which, our misfortunes might easily pervert our judgment; and our minds, sore from the loss of national glory, might feel every blow of fortune as a crime in government."

Let us now turn from these to one or two extracts from Junius. Alluding to the conduct of the ministry, with respect to Falkland Islands, he says:—"Violence and oppression at home can only be supported *by treachery and submission abroad*. When the civil rights of the people are daringly invaded on one side, what have we to expect, but that their political rights should be deserted and betrayed, in the same proportion, on the other? The plan of domestic policy, which has been invariably pursued from the moment of his present Majesty's accession,

engrosses all the attention of his servants. They know, that the security of their places depends upon their maintaining, at any hazard, the secret system of the closet. *A foreign war might embarrass, an unfavourable event might ruin the minister, and defeat the deep-laid scheme of policy, to which he and his associates owe their employments. Rather than suffer the execution of that scheme to be delayed, or interrupted, the king has been advised to make a public surrender, a solemn sacrifice, in the face of all Europe, not only of the interests of his subjects, but of his own personal reputation, and of the dignity of that crown which his predecessors have worn with honour.*" (See Junius, Let. XLII. Jan. 30, 1771).

Mr. Burke, touching on the same topics, has the following observations:—"The interior ministry are sensible, *that war is a situation which sets in its full light the value of the hearts of the people; and they well know, that the beginning of the importance of the people must be the end of theirs. For this reason they discover, upon all occasions, the utmost fear of every thing, which, by possibility, may lead to such an event. I do not mean, that they manifest any of that pious fear, which is backward to commit the safety of*

the country to the dubious experiment of war. Such a fear, being the tender sensation of virtue, excited, as it is regulated, by reason, frequently shows itself in a seasonable boldness, which keeps danger at a distance, by seeming to despise it. Their fear betrays to the first glance of the eye, its true cause and its real object. *Foreign powers, confident in the knowledge of their character, have not scrupled to violate the most solemn treaties ; and, in defiance of them, to make conquests in the midst of a general peace, and in the heart of Europe.* Such was the conquest of Corsica, by the professed enemies of the freedom of mankind, in defiance of those, who were formerly its professed defenders. We have had just claims upon the same powers ; rights which ought to have been sacred to them, as well as to us, as they had their origin in our lenity and generosity towards France and Spain, in the day of their great humiliation—Such I call the ransom of Manilla, and the demand on France for the East India prisoners. But these powers put a just confidence in their resource of *the Double Cabinet*. These demands, (one of them at least) are hastening fast towards an acquittal by prescription. Oblivion begins to spread her cobwebs over all our spirited remonstrances. Some of the most valuable branches of our

trade are also on the point of perishing from the same cause. I do not mean those branches, which bear without the hand of the vine-dresser; I mean those, which the policy of treaties had formerly secured to us; I mean the trade of Portugal, the loss of which, and the power of the Cabal, have one and the same era."

There are many other passages in the tract "*On the Cause of the present Discontents*," which are similar to the above extract from Junius, not only in the manner, but also in their contents. As most of them, however, are too long for transcription, I must refer the reader generally to that tract, many parts of which may, indeed, be well considered as a very good general commentary upon the contents of the passage just quoted from Junius. This, I think, will readily appear to any body who reads Burke's account of the origin, constitution, and policy of the *Double Cabinet*.

In pourtraying the designs of that cabinet, and its plans to get rid of Mr. Pitt and the Whig interest, he remarks:—"The power of that gentleman was vast indeed, and merited; but it was in a great degree personal, and therefore transient. Theirs was rooted in the country.



For, with a good deal less of popularity, they possessed a far more natural and fixed influence. Long possession of government ; vast property ; obligations of favours given and received ; connection of office ; ties of blood, of alliance, of friendship, (things at that time supposed of some force) ; the name of Whig dear to the majority of the people ; the zeal early begun and steadily continued to the Royal Family ; all these together formed a body of power in the nation, *which was criminal and devoted.*" In a subsequent paragraph he writes as follows:—

" Thus for the time were pulled down, in the persons of the Whig leaders and of Mr. Pitt, (in spite of the services of the one at the accession of the Royal Family, and the recent services of the other in the war), the two only securities for the importance of the people ; power arising from popularity, and power arising from connection. Here and there, indeed, a few individuals were left standing, *who gave security for their total estrangement from the odious principles of party connection and personal attachment ;* and it must be confessed, that most of them have religiously kept their faith. Such a change, however, could not be made without a mighty shock to government."

A little before he says, (speaking of the Double Cabinet)—“It happened very favourably for the new system, that, under a *forced coalition*, there rankled an incurable alienation and disgust between the parties which composed the administration. Mr. Pitt was first attacked. Not satisfied with *removing him from power*, they endeavoured, by various artifices, *to ruin his character*. The other party, not perceiving that their own fall was prepared by his, and involved in it, seemed rather pleased *to get rid of so oppressive a support*.” Again, alluding to the plans of this cabal, he remarks, that in order “to recommend this system to the people, a perspective view of the court, gorgeously painted, and finely illuminated from within, was exhibited to the gaping multitude. Party was to be totally done away, with all its evil works\*. Corruption was to be

\* Junius often touches upon this project of the court for the abolition of party. Thus even in his first letter; (see vol. i. p. 50.) “The idea of uniting all parties, of trying all characters, and of distributing the offices of state by rotation, was gracious and benevolent to an extreme, though it has not yet produced the many salutary effects which were intended by it. To say nothing of the wisdom of such a plan, it undoubtedly arose from an unbounded goodness of heart, in which folly had no share.” And again—“He (the King) found this country in that state of perfect union and happiness, which good government naturally produces, and which a bad one has destroyed. He promised to abolish all distinctions of party, and kept his word by declaring Lord



cast down from court, as *Até* was from heaven. Power was to be thence-forward the *chosen residence of public spirit*; and no one was to be supposed under any sinister influence, except those who had the misfortune to be in disgrace at court, which was to stand in lieu of all vices and all corruptions."

In another part of this unrivalled tract, through the whole of which we trace the opinions, the manner, the vigour, and the spirit of Junius, we find him remarking, that "the discretionary power of the crown, in the formation of ministry, abused by bad or weak men, has given rise to a system, which, *without directly violating the letter of any law, operates against the spirit of the whole constitution*. A plan of favouritism for our executory government is essentially at variance with the plan of our Legislature. One great end undoubtedly of a mixed government

Bute his favourite and minister, by proscribing the whole Whig interest of England, and filling every place of trust and profit under his government with professed Tories, notorious Jacobites, and Scotchmen of all denominations. He abolished no distinctions but those which are essential to the safety of the constitution." (Vol. iii. p. 371). These are exactly in the same spirit with some of the last quoted extracts from Mr. Burke, where he mentions the project for abolishing party distinctions, and for getting rid of the Whigs.

like ours, composed of monarchy, and of controuls on the part of the higher people and the lower, is, that the Prince shall not be able to violate the laws. This is useful, indeed, and fundamental. But this, even, at first view, is no more than *a negative advantage, an armour merely defensive*. It is therefore next in order and equal in importance, that the discretionary powers, which are necessarily vested in the Monarch, whether for the execution of the laws, or for the nomination to magistracy and office, or for conducting the affairs of peace and war, or for ordering the revenue, should all be exercised upon public principles and national grounds, and not on the likings or prejudices, the intrigues, or policies of a court.” “Again; when, therefore, the abettors of the new system tell us, that, between them and their opposers, there is nothing but a struggle for power, and that, therefore, we are no ways concerned in it; we must tell those, who have the impudence to insult us in this manner, that of all things we ought to be the most concerned, who and what sort of men they are that hold the trust of every thing that is dear to us. Nothing can render this a point of indifference to the nation, but what must either render us totally desperate, or soothe us into the security of idiots. *We must soften into*

*a credulity below the milkiness of infancy to think all men virtuous. We must be tainted with a malignity, truly diabolical, to believe all the world to be equally wicked and corrupt. Men are in public life, as in private, some good, some evil. The elevation of the one and the depression of the other, are the first objects of all true policy."* \*\*\*

*"Every good political institution must have a preventive operation, as well as a remedial. It ought to have a natural tendency to exclude bad men from government, and not to trust for the safety of the state to subsequent punishment alone; punishment, which has ever been tardy and uncertain, and which, when power is suffered in bad hands, may chance to fall rather on the injured, than the criminal."*

In allusion to the accounts given by the cabal, or double cabinet, of the discontents of the people and their causes, he says, "If the wealth of the nation be the cause of its turbulence, I imagine it is not proposed to introduce poverty, as a constable to keep the peace. If our dominions abroad are the roots, which feed all this rank luxuriance of sedition, it is not intended to cut them off in order to famish the fruit. If our liberty has enfeebled the executive power, there

is no design, I hope, to call in the aid of despotism to fill up the deficiencies of the law." To these extracts may be added, from the same pamphlet, part of his character of George II. "In times full of doubt and danger to his person and family, George II. maintained the dignity of his crown connected with the liberty of his people, not only *unimpaired*, but *improved*, for the space of thirty-three years. He overcame a dangerous rebellion, abetted by foreign force, and raging in the heart of his kingdoms; and thereby destroyed the seeds of all future rebellion that could arise upon the same principle. He carried the glory, the power, the commerce of England to an height, unknown even to this renowned nation in the times of its greatest prosperity; and he left his succession resting on the true, and only true, foundations of all national and all regal greatness, affection at home, reputation abroad, trust in allies, terror in rival nations\*."

Through all the writings of Junius, now collected in the new edition, whatever be the sig-

\* The same opinions are maintained by Junius in all parts of his writings. Some of the passages will be noticed in a subsequent part of this inquiry.

nature, which he assumes, we find a variety of passages, written in the same spirit with those just quoted from Mr. Burke. Even in his first letter, under the signature of Junius, we find him remarking, in the same strain: “ *The ruin, or prosperity of a state depends so much upon the administration of its government, that, to be acquainted with the merit of a ministry, we need only observe the condition of the people. If we see them obedient to the laws, prosperous in their industry, united at home, and respected abroad, we may reasonably presume, that their affairs are conducted by men of experience, abilities, and virtue. If, on the contrary, we see an universal spirit of distrust and dissatisfaction, a rapid decay of trade, dissensions in all parts of the empire, and a total loss of respect in the eyes of foreign powers, we may pronounce, without hesitation, that the government of that country is weak, distracted and corrupt. The multitude in all countries are patient to a certain point. Ill usage may rouse their indignation, and hurry them into excesses; but the original fault is in the government.* Perhaps there never was an instance of a change in the circumstances and temper of a whole nation, so sudden and extraordinary, as that which the misconduct of ministers has, within

*these very few years, produced in Great Britain."*

\*\*\* " Yet there is no extremity of distress, which of itself ought to reduce a great nation to despair. *It is not the disorder, but the physician; it is not a casual concurrence of calamitous circumstances, it is the pernicious hand of government, which alone can make a whole people desperate.*" And to the same effect, in an earlier part of the same letter: " While the national honour is firmly maintained abroad, and while justice is impartially administered at home, the obedience of the subject will be voluntary, cheerful, and, I might almost say, unlimited." In his first letter to Sir William Draper, he also remarks: " A little calm reflection might have shown you, *that national calamities do not arise from the description, but from the real character and conduct of ministers.*" (Vol. i. p. 71.) It is unnecessary to quote more from Junius on this subject: but it will be proper to lay before the reader some of Mr. Burke's opinions on the same points. The coincidence, in my mind, is clear and striking.

In his Thoughts on the Cause of the present Discontents, he says, " I am not one of those who think, that the people are never in the wrong. They have been so frequently and out-



rageously, both in other countries and in this. *But I do say, that in all disputes between them and their rulers, the presumption is at least upon a par in favour of the people.* Experience may, perhaps, justify me in going farther. Where popular discontents have been very prevalent, it may well be affirmed and supported, that there has been generally something found amiss in the constitution, or in the conduct of the government. *The people have no interest in disorder. When they do wrong, it is their error and not their crime. But, with the governing part of the state, it is far otherwise. They may certainly act ill by design, as well as by mistake.* \*\*\*

“What he says of revolutions is equally true of all great disturbances. If this presumption in favour of the subjects against the trustees of power be not the more probable, I am sure it is the more comfortable speculation; because it is more easy to change an administration, than to reform a people.” This seems to have been a favourite doctrine with Mr. Burke, as it occurs pretty frequently in his writings: thus he says in his letter to the sheriffs of Bristol, (see works, vol. iii. p. 170.) “They have been told, that their dissent from violent measures is an encouragement to rebellion. Men of great

presumption and little knowledge will hold a language, which is contradicted by the whole course of history. *General rebellions and revolts of an whole people never were encouraged, now, or at any time. They are always provoked.*" It is not a little singular, that Lord Mansfield is known to have maintained a similar doctrine. "The people," says he, "are almost always in the right. The great may sometimes be in the wrong; but the body of the people are always in the right." The following extract from a speech, which Mr. Burke made on the 27th of Nov. 1770, is still more in point: and, in truth, is the same with the above passage from Junius, only in different words. "What is the cause of this general aversion to law, this universal conspiracy against government? *It does not arise from the natural depravity of the people, nor from the accidental misbehaviour of our courts of law. The whole is chargeable upon administration. The ministers are the general criminals. It is their malversation and unconstitutional encroachments that have roused up in the nation this spirit of opposition, which tramples under foot all law, order, and decorum. Till they are removed and punished the kingdom will be a scene of anarchy and confusion.*"



Mr. Burke, in his memorial to the king, has again the same doctrine, which clearly shows, that it was one of his favourite opinions. "We deplore, along with your majesty, the distractions and disorders, which prevail in your empire. *But we are convinced, that the disorders of the people, in the present time, are owing to the usual and natural cause of such disorders at all times—the misconduct of the government; that they are owing to plans laid in error, pursued with obstinacy, and conducted without wisdom.*" If the reader is not convinced, by a mere comparison of these passages from the works of Burke and of Junius, that they are the production of the same author, he is not likely to be convinced by any comments that can be made on the subject. Nor, indeed, is it my intention to encumber a point, already sufficiently clear, by the addition of any unnecessary argument or illustration.

To show Mr. Burke's partiality for the people about the period in question, I may add the following extracts. In a speech, on the affairs of Canada in 1774, he said, "If the *noblesse* were the only persons, as they appeared to be by the evidence at the bar, who were against the English laws, *he would*

*sacrifice them and all the noblesse of England and other countries\*, but he would make the people happy."*

This last doctrine occurs frequently in his

\* Mr. Wilkes having published some spirited remarks on the selfish and time-serving conduct of what he called *great men* (meaning the higher orders), was complimented on it by Junius, in one of his private letters. "Nothing," says he, "can be more true, than what you say about *great men*. *They are, indeed, a worthless pitiful race.*" In another of his letters to Wilkes he has these words: "At the same time, that I think it good policy to pay those compliments to Lord Chatham, which, in truth, he has nobly deserved, I should be glad to mortify those contemptible creatures, who call themselves noblemen, whose worthless importance depends entirely upon their influence over boroughs, which cannot be safely diminished, but by increasing the power of the counties at large." Burke was not a more profound admirer of the great men (or the nobility), not conceiving them to be very eminent either for talents or virtue. His remark, when speaking, one day, on the debauchery of high life, and its evil consequences, is well known: "It is no wonder," said he, "that the issue of the marriage bed should be puny and degenerate, when children are formed out of the rinsing of bottles." Mr. Burke, it is true, was a friend to aristocracy; not to that of property, however, but to an aristocracy of property, united to an aristocracy of talents and virtue. In the following extract, from his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*, he agrees exactly with Junius. "He is but a poor observer, who has not seen, that the generality of peers, far from supporting themselves in a state of independent greatness, are but too apt to fall into an oblivion of their proper dignity, and to run headlong into an abject servitude. Would to God it were true, that the fault of our peers were too much spirit!"

writings. "The question with me is, not *whether you have a right to render your people miserable, but whether it is not your interest to make them happy*. It is not what a lawyer tells me I *may* do, but what humanity, reason, and justice, tell me I ought to do." (Vol. iii. p. 75.) And again, "I had, indeed, very earnest wishes to keep the whole body of this authority perfect and entire as I found it, and to keep it so, not for our advantage solely; *but principally for the sake of those, on whose account all just authority exists; I mean the people to be governed.*" (Ibid. p. 178.) In their partiality for the people, both Burke and Junius carry this doctrine even still further. "I never knew a writer on the theory of government (says Burke) so partial to authority, as not to allow, *that the hostile mind of the rulers to their people did fully justify a change of government*; nor can any reason whatever be given, why one people should voluntarily yield any degree of pre-eminence to another, but on a supposition of great affection and benevolence towards them." (Vol. iii. p. 163.) "If he loves his people (says Junius speaking of the King) he will dissolve a parliament, which they can never confide in, or respect. If he has any regard for his own honour, he will disdain to be any longer connected with

such abandoned prostitution. But, if it were conceivable, that a king of this country had lost all personal honour, and all concern for the welfare of his subjects, *I confess, Sir, I should be contented to renounce the forms of the constitution once more, if there were no other way to obtain substantial justice for the people.*" (Vol. ii. p. 220.) The following short passage in the Dedication of Junius contains the same doctrine with that quoted above from the works of Mr. Burke, (Vol. iii. p. 178.) "The power of king, lords, and commons, is not an arbitrary power. *They are the trustees, not the owners of the estate. The fee simple is in us. They cannot alienate, they cannot waste.*" And to the same purport, Mr. Burke, in his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*, says, "The king is the representative of the people; so are the lords; so are the judges. *They are all trustees for the people, as well as the commons; because no power is given for the sole sake of the holder;* and, although government certainly is an institution of divine authority, *yet its forms, and the persons, who administer it, all originate from the people.*"

That Junius also was fond of the mob, or people, is clear even from his private letters to

Mr. Wilkes : “ Depend upon it (says he to him on the 23d of Sept. 1771), the perpetual union of Wilkes and mob does you no service. *Not but that I love and esteem the mob.* It is your interest to keep up dignity and gravity besides. I would not make myself cheap by walking the streets so much as you do. *Verbum sat.*”

Nor are those already mentioned the only instances in which we find Burke agreeing with Junius, both in style and in sentiment. There are no parts of his writings almost, from which instances of a similar nature might not be selected, though they occur more frequently in his early speeches and tracts. Many might be cited from his *Observations* on a pamphlet, entitled, *The present State of the Nation*. The picture, which he gives of this tract, in his *Observations*, is much in the manner of Junius. When controverting the opinions of the writer on the subject of the war, which Mr. Burke maintains, in opposition to him, to have been most prosperous, and attended with an immense increase of trade and augmentation of revenue, he says, that the disappointments, defeats, distresses, and irreparable losses of the enemy left them entirely at our mercy, in the opinion of the whole world,

*“except the friends of the then ministry, who wept for our victories, and were in haste to get rid of the burden of our conquests.”* He ascribes the gloomy misrepresentation given by his opponent of the state of the country to the circumstance of his being out of office. *“The same sun, which gilds all nature, and exhilarates the whole creation, does not shine upon disappointed ambition. It is something that rays out of darkness, and inspires nothing but gloom and melancholy. Men in this deplorable state of mind, find a comfort in spreading the contagion of their spleen. They find an advantage too; for it is a general popular error to imagine, the loudest complainers for the public to be the most anxious for its welfare. If such persons can answer the end of relief and profit to themselves, they are apt to be careless enough about either the means or the consequences.”* And in another part of the same tract, he says, that *“His plan of reform in the internal representation of Great Britain, by enlarging the number of constituents; and his scheme of an addition to our representatives, by new American members of parliament, are no less absurd. Much extravagance appears without any fancy, and the judgment is shocked, without any thing to refresh the imagination.”*



The very beautiful passage too in this tract, in which he pourtrays the gradations of political profligacy, with so much eloquence and success, may be cited as affording specimens of the manner of Junius. As it is, however, too long, I shall confine myself to a few sentences. "I believe the instances are exceedingly rare of men's immediately passing over a clear marked line of virtue into declared vice and corruption." \*\*\* "Gradually they are habituated to other company; and a change in their habitudes soon makes a way for a change in their opinions. *Certain persons are no longer so frightful, when they come to be known and to be serviceable. As to their old friends, the transition is easy from friendship to civility; from civility to enmity: few are the steps from dereliction to persecution.*" \*\*\* "Every former profession of public spirit is considered as a debauch of youth; or, at best, as a visionary scheme of unattainable perfection. The very idea of consistency is exploded. The convenience of the business of the day is to furnish the principle for doing it." \*\*\* "Flattering themselves that their power is become necessary to the support of all order and government, every thing which tends to the support of that power is sanctified." \*\*\* "They are delivered up into the hands of those who feel neither respect for their persons, nor gra-



*itude for their favours.” \*\*\* “ At length they are cast off with scorn ; they are turned out, emptied of all natural character, of all intrinsic worth, of all essential dignity, and deprived of every consolation of friendship. Having rendered all retreat to old principles ridiculous, and to old regards impracticable ; not being able to counterfeit pleasure, or to discharge discontent ; nothing being sincere or right, or balanced in their minds, it is more than a chance that, in the delirium of the last stage of their distempered power, they make an insane political testament, by which they throw all their remaining weight and consequence into the scale of their declared enemies.”*

In a speech on American affairs, which he made on the 9th of May, 1770, and in which he advocated several resolutions for censuring all the measures lately pursued with respect to America, and contended that every step taken by the ministry had terminated in exciting abhorrence, or contempt, he said : “ *Thus the malignity of your will is abhorred ; the debility of your power is contemned ; and parliament, which you have persuaded to sanction your follies, is exposed to dishonour.*” When a motion was made on the 3d of February, 1769, for the expulsion

of Mr. Wilkes, Mr. Burke, in his speech, called the proposed vote of expulsion—" *the fifth act of a tragi-comedy, performed by his Majesty's servants, for the benefit of Mr. Wilkes, and at the expense of the constitution.*"

Those who remember the beautiful passage, in which Junius describes the declining patriotism of Mr. Horne, will probably be disposed to think, that the following has some resemblance to it. It is that, in which Burke, alluding to the rising genius of Charles Townshend, at a time when the talents of Lord Chatham were on the decline, said, "Before this splendid orb was entirely set, and while the western horizon was in a blaze with his descending glory, on the opposite quarter of the heavens arose another luminary, and, for his hour, became lord of the ascendant."

When Mr. Burke and some of his friends, at the end of the year 1776, partially seceded from parliament, he drew up an address in justification of the measure, with a view of having it presented to the King. In this I find several passages which resemble Junius in style, as well as in opinion. The entire address is, indeed, written with uncommon spirit and ability. It appears to me to have been greatly laboured;

and, on that account, resembles the nervous concentrated manner of Junius more than the profuse expansion of Mr. Burke. "A situation without example necessitates a conduct without precedent." \*\*\*. We deplore, along with your Majesty, the distractions and disorders which prevail in your empire. But, *we are convinced, that the disorders of the people, in the present time, are owing to the usual and natural cause of such disorders at all times. The misconduct of the government ; that they are owing to plans laid in error, pursued with obstinacy, and conducted without wisdom.*" Of the cause of the disorders in America, he says, "That grievance is as simple in its nature, and as level to the most ordinary understanding, as it is powerful in affecting to the most languid passions. It is an attempt made to dispose of the whole property of a whole people without their consent." In allusion to the disturbances he goes on to remark, that "This sense has been declared by the unanimous voice of all their assemblies ; each assembly also perfectly unanimous within itself : it has been declared as fully by the actual voice of the people *without* these assemblies, as by the constructive voice *within* them ; as well by those who *addressed*, as by those who *remonstrated* ; and it is as much the avowed sense of those

who have risked their all rather than take up arms against your Majesty's forces, as of those who have run the same risk to oppose them. The only difference among them is, not on the grievance, but on the mode of redress; and we are sorry to say, that they who have conceived hopes from the placability of those ministers, that influence the public councils of this kingdom, disappear in the multitude, *who conceive that passive compliance only confirms and emboldens oppression. The sense of a whole people, most gracious Sovereign, ought never to be contemned by wise and beneficent rulers,\** whatever may be the

\* On the point, that the sense and feelings of their subjects are not to be contemned by wise rulers, Junius coincides with Mr. Burke. "Whatever style of contempt may be adopted by ministers, or parliaments, *no man sincerely despises the voice of the English nation.* The House of Commons are only interpreters, whose duty it is to convey the sense of the people faithfully to the crown. If the interpretation be false, or imperfect, the constituent powers are called upon to deliver their own sentiments. Their speech is rude, but intelligible; their gestures fierce, but full of explanation." (Vol. ii. p. 134.) "Sir William Draper does himself but little honour in opposing the general sense of his country. *The people are seldom wrong in their opinions, in their sentiments they are never mistaken.*" (Ibid. p. 17.) "His Majesty will find at last, that this is the sense of his people; and, that it is not his interest to support either ministry or parliament, at the hazard of a breach with the collective body of his subjects." (Vol. ii. p. 122.) To these I may be permitted to add the following extracts: "For as the Sabbath, (though of divine institution) was made for man, not man for the Sabbath, go-

abstract claims, or even rights of the supreme power. We have been too early instructed, and

vernment, which can claim no higher origin or authority, in its exercise, at least, *ought to conform to the exigencies of the time, and the temper and character of the people, with whom it is concerned; and not always to attempt violently to bend the people to their theories of subjection.* The bulk of mankind, on their part, are not excessively curious concerning any theories, whilst they are really happy; and one sure symptom of an ill-conducted state is the propensity of the people to resort to them." (Burke's Works, vol. iii. p. 186.) I find the following remark in his speech on American taxation: "It is impossible to answer for bodies of men. But I am sure the natural effect of fidelity, clemency, kindness in governors, is peace, good-will, order, and esteem, on the part of the governed." And, in the same speech, "After this experience, nobody shall persuade me, when an whole people are concerned, that acts of lenity are not means of conciliation." The following extract is taken from a letter addressed to the gentlemen of Buckinghamshire, on the subject of parliamentary reform: "I most heartily wish, that the deliberative sense of the kingdom on this great subject should be known. When it is known it must be prevalent. It would be dreadful, indeed, if there were any power in the nation *capable of resisting its unanimous desire, or even the desire of any great or very decided majority of the people.* The people may be deceived in their choice of an object, but I can scarcely conceive any choice they can make to be so mischievous as the existence of any human force capable of resisting it. It will certainly be the duty of every man, in the situation to which God has called him, to give his best opinion and advice upon the matter; it *will not* be his duty (let him think what he will) to use any violent or fraudulent means of counteracting the general wish, or even of employing *the legal and constructive organ* of expressing the people's sense against the sense which they so *actually* entertained." "I must beg leave to observe, that it is not only the invidious branch of taxation, that will be resisted, but, *that no other given part of legislative rights*

too long habituated to believe, that *the only firm seat of all authority is in the minds, affections and interests of the people\**, to change our sentiments

*can be exercised, without regard to the general opinion of those who are to be governed. That general opinion is the vehicle and organ of legislative omnipotence.*" (Burke's Works, vol. iii. p. 179.) "In effect, to follow, not to force the public inclination; to give a direction, a form, a technical dress, and a specific sanction to the general sense of the community, is the true end of legislature." (Ibid. p. 180).

\* Mr. Burke often touches on this point. Thus, "without something of this kind I do not see how it is ever practicable really to reconcile with those (the people) *whose affection, after all, must be the surest hold of our government*; and which is a thousand times of more worth to us than the mercenary zeal of all the circles of Germany." (Vol. iii. p. 159). "I confess, that I should prefer independency without a war, to independency with it: and I have so much trust in the inclinations and prejudices of mankind, and so little in any thing else, *that I should expect ten times more benefit to this kingdom from the affection of America*, though under a separate establishment, than from her perfect submission to the crown and parliament, accompanied with her terror, disgust, and abhorrence." (Ibid. p. 194.) Junius agrees with Mr. Burke, that the firmest seat and best security of authority is in the interests and affections of the people. Thus, in his preface, where he says to the King—"Sir, you alone are the author of the greatest wrong to your subjects and to yourself. *Instead of reigning in the hearts of your people, instead of commanding their lives and fortunes through the medium of their affections*, has not the strength of the crown, whether influence or prerogative, been uniformly exerted, for eleven years together, to support a narrow, pitiful system of government, which defeats itself, and answers no one purpose of real power, profit, or personal satisfaction to you?" (Vol. i. p. 42, 3.) And again, "An amiable, accomplished prince ascends the throne *under the happiest of all auspices, the acclamations and united affections of his subjects.*" (Ibid. p. 151.) And to the same effect, "What



for the convenience of a temporary arrangement of state. *It is not consistent with equity, or wisdom, to set at defiance the general feelings of great communities, and all the orders which compose them. Much power is tolerated, and passes unquestioned, where much is yielded to opinion, all is disputed where every thing is enforced.* This is the tenet we hold on the duty and policy of conforming to the prejudices of a whole people, even where the foundation of such prejudices may be false or disputable. But permit us to lay at your Majesty's feet our deliberate judgment on the real merits of that principle, the violation of which is the known ground and origin of these troubles. We assure your Majesty, that, on our parts, we should think ourselves unworthy

is the dignity of the crown, though it were really maintained; what is the honour of parliament, supposing it could exist without any foundation of integrity, or justice; or what is the vain reputation of firmness, even if the scheme of government were uniform and consistent, *compared with the heart-felt affections of the people, with the happiness and security of the Royal Family, or even with the grateful acclamations of the populace?*" (Junius, Vol. ii. p. 133-4, and *ibid.* 194.) "No man carries farther, than I do, the policy of making government pleasing to the people." (Speech at Bristol.) "They may be assured, that however they amuse themselves with a variety of projects for substituting something else in the place of that great and only foundation of government, the confidence of the people, every attempt will but make their condition worse." (Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents, p. 56; see also *ibid.* p. 2.)



of life, *which we value only for the means of spending it in honour and virtue*, if we ever submitted to taxes, to which we did not consent, either directly, or by a representation satisfactory to the body of the people\*." \*\*\*. "Abuses of

\* Is not the masterly hand, which produced this, clearly discernible in the following beautiful passage in Junius? "We owe it to our ancestors, to preserve entire those rights which they have delivered to our care: we owe it to our posterity not to suffer their dearest inheritance to be destroyed. But, if it were possible for us to be insensible of these sacred claims, there is yet an obligation binding upon ourselves, from which nothing can acquit us; a personal interest, which we cannot surrender. To alienate even our own rights would be a crime, as much more enormous than suicide, *as a life of civil security and freedom is superior to a bare existence; and, if life be the bounty of heaven, we scornfully reject the noblest part of the gift, if we consent to surrender that certain rule of living, without which the condition of human nature is not only miserable but contemptible.*" (Junius, Vol. i. p. 223-4.) The following extract from his Dedication contains partly the same sentiments. "When you leave the unimpaired hereditary freehold to your children, you do but half your duty. Both liberty and property are precarious, unless the possessors have sense and spirit enough to defend them." Mr. Burke, hints at the doctrine, principally alluded to in the above extracts, in other parts of his writings: Thus, in his speech on American conciliation—"In this character of the Americans, a love of freedom is the predominating feature, which marks and distinguishes the whole: and, as an ardent is always a jealous affection, your colonies become suspicious, restive and untractable, whenever they see the least attempt to wrest from them by force, or shuffle from them by chicane, *what they think the only advantage worth living for.*" (Burke's Works, Vol. iii. p. 49.) The reader may also look into the last paragraph of the thirtieth Letter of Junius, (Vol. ii. p. 44) where, I think, he will be able to recognise sentiments of a similar nature, as well as in the

subordinate authority increase, and all means of redress lessen, as the distance of the subject removes him from the seat of the supreme power. What, in those circumstances, can save him from the last extremes of indignity and oppression, but something left in his own hands, which may enable him *to conciliate the favour, and controul the excesses of government?* When no means are possessed of power to awe, or to oblige, the strongest ties which connect mankind in every relation, social and civil, and which teach them mutually to respect each other, are broken. *Independency from that moment virtually exists. Its formal declaration will quickly follow. Such must be our feelings for ourselves. We are not in possession of another rule for our brethren.* When the late attempt practically to annihilate that privilege was made, great disorders and tumults very unhappily and very naturally arose from it. In this state of things, we were of opinion, that satisfaction ought instantly to be given, or that,

following passage in his letter to the King: “But if the English people should no longer confine their resentment to a submissive representation of their wrongs; if, following the glorious example of their ancestors, they should no longer appeal to the creature of the constitution, but to that High Being, *who gave them the rights of humanity, whose gifts it were sacrilege to surrender,* let me ask you, sir, upon what part of your subjects would you rely for assistance?”

at least, the punishment of the disorder ought to be attended with the redress of the grievances: Because, *whenever a disorder arises from, and is directly connected with a grievance, to confine ourselves to the punishment of the disorder is to declare against the reason and justice of the complaint.*" "The methods then recommended and followed, as infallible means of restoring peace and order, we could not consider as, at all, adapted to these purposes:—on the contrary, we looked upon them to be, *what they have proved to be, the cause of inflaming discontents into disobedience, and resistance into revolt.*"

Are not these the exact sentiments of Junius? and is there a passage in all his writings, which possesses more of his peculiar style and manner, or which has more of his proverbial vigour, than the following, taken from this able and admirable address? "We could not conceive, when disorders had arisen from the complaint of one violated right, that *to violate every other* was the proper means of *quieting exasperated minds*. Recourse was had to force, and we saw a force sent out, *enough to menace liberty, but not to awe resistance*; tending to bring *odium* on the *civil power*, and *contempt* on the *military*; at once to provoke and encourage resistance. This mode

of proceeding, by *harsh laws*, and *feeble armies* could not be defended on the principle of mercy and forbearance; for mercy, as we consider, *consists not in the weakness of the means, but in the benignity of the ends.* We apprehend, that *mild measures* may be *powerfully enforced*; and that *acts of extreme rigour and injustice* may be *attended with as much feebleness in the execution, as severity in the formation.*”—On the subject of America he still goes on:—“In consequence of these terrors, which, falling upon some, threatened all, the Colonies made a common cause with the sufferers, and proceeded, on their parts, to acts of resistance. Again, we besought your Majesty’s ministers to entertain some distrust of the operation of coercive measures, and to profit of their experience. This experience had no effect. The modes of legislative rigour were construed not to have been erroneous in their policy, but too limited in their extent. New severities were adopted. The fisheries of your people in America followed their charters; and their mutual combination to defend their common rights brought on a prohibition of their mutual commercial intercourse. No distinction of persons or merits was observed; *the peaceable and the mutinous, friends and foes, were alike involved, as if the rigour of the law had a ten-*

dency to recommend the authority of the legislator." \*\*\* "It seemed to us absurd, in the highest degree, to hold out, as a means of quieting a people on the point of taking arms, the austere law, which a rigid conqueror would enforce on his ultimate success. *Force was sent out not sufficient to hold one town; laws were passed to inflame thirteen provinces; at length British blood was spilt by British hands! a fatal era! which we must ever deplore, because your empire will for ever feel it.* Your Majesty was touched with a sense of so great a disaster; your paternal breast was affected with the sufferings of your English subjects in America. You inclined to relieve their distresses, and to pardon their errors. You felt their sufferings under the late penal acts of parliament; but your ministry felt differently: not discouraged by the pernicious consequences of all they had hitherto advised, they obtained another act of parliament, in which *the rigours of all the former were consolidated and embittered by circumstances of additional severity and outrage.* The whole trading property, even innoxious shipping in port, was indiscriminately and irrecoverably given, as the plunder of foreign enemies, to the sailors of your navy. This property was put out of the reach of your mercy. Your people were despoiled,

and your navy, by a new, dangerous, prolific example, corrupted with the plunder of their countrymen. They were put in their general and political, as well as personal capacities, out of the protection of your government. They were put on the footing not only of foreigners, but of foreign enemies." \*\*\* "We are sure, that we have your Majesty's heart along with us, when we declare *in favour of mixing something conciliatory with our force*; and had rather they should yield to *well-ascertained and well-authenticated terms of reconciliation*, than that *your Majesty should owe the recovery of your dominions to their total waste and destruction*; or suffer difficult questions, lying deep in the vital principles of the British constitution, to be solved by the coarse barbarism and very unprincipled military conduct of German mercenaries."

\*\*\*. "To leave any real freedom to parliament much must be left to the colonies. Military power is the only substitute for civil liberty. That the establishment of such a power will exhaust our finances, though a certain effect, is the least of our apprehensions. It will become an apt instrument of destroying our freedom. Great forces of armed men, kept up for the purpose of trampling on the express image of English privileges, will come rather to hate the principles



they oppress, than to make distinctions among those who adhere to it. All our troops, in the rotation of service, will pass through this discipline, and must contract these habits. We deprecate the consequence. We deprecate the effect of the doctrines, which must support and countenance the government over conquered Englishmen. It will be impossible long to resist, the powerful and equitable arguments in favour of the freedom of these unhappy people, to be drawn from the principle of our own liberty. Attempts will be made, attempts have been made, to ridicule and to argue away this principle, and to inculcate into the minds of your people other maxims of government, and other grounds of obedience, than those, which have prevailed at and since the glorious revolution. *By degrees, these doctrines, by being convenient may grow prevalent ; the consequence is not certain : but a general change of principles rarely happens among a people, without leading to a change of government.* \*\*\* “ Sire, your throne cannot stand secure upon the principles of unconditional submission, or passive obedience, on powers exercised without the concurrence of the people to be governed, on acts made in defiance of their prejudices and habits, on acquiescence procured by foreign mercenary troops, and secured by standing armies.



*They may possibly be the foundation of other thrones ; they must be the subversion of yours."*

*" It was not to passive principles in our ancestors, that we owe the honour of appearing before a sovereign, who cannot feel, that he is a prince, without knowing, that we ought to be free. The revolution is a departure from the ancient course of the descent of this monarchy. The people re-entered into their original rights ; and it was not because a positive law authorised the act, but because the freedom and safety of the subject, the origin and cause of all laws, required a proceeding paramount and superior to them. At that ever memorable and instructive period the letter of the law was superseded in favour of the substance of liberty. To the free choice, therefore, of the people, without either king or parliament, we owe that happy establishment, of which both king and parliament were regenerated."*

*" From that great principle of liberty these statutes have originated, which have confirmed and ratified that establishment, from which your Majesty derives your right to rule over us\*. These statutes have not given us our liberties :*

\* In his address to the King, Junius says:—" Nor can you ever succeed, unless he (Wilkes) should be imprudent enough to forfeit the protection of those laws to which you owe your crown."

*our liberties have produced them. Every hour of your Majesty's reign, your title stands upon the very same foundation, on which it was first laid; and we do not know a better on which it can possibly be placed. Convinced, that you cannot have different rights and different security in different parts of your dominions, we wish to lay an even platform for your throne, and to give it an immoveable stability, by laying it on the general freedom of your people, and by securing equally to your Majesty, that confidence and affection, in all parts of your dominions, which make your best security and dearest title in this chief seat of your empire\*."* "Such, sire, being amongst us the foundation of the monarchy itself, much more clearly and peculiarly is it the ground of all parliamentary power. *Parliament is a security provided for the protection of freedom, and not a subtle fiction contrived to amuse the people in its place†*; and the authority of both Houses can still less than that of the crown be supported upon different principles, or different places, so as to be for one part of your subjects a protector of liberty, and for another a fund of despotism, by which prerogative is ex-

\* Vide supra, p. 45, of this Inquiry; and the note, *ibid.*

† See p. 16 of this Inquiry; and the notes, *ibid.*

tended by occasional powers, whenever an arbitrary will finds itself streightened by the restrictions of law. Had it seemed good to Parliament to consider itself as the indulgent guardian and strong protector of the freedom of the subordinate popular assemblies, instead of exercising its powers to their utter annihilation, there is no doubt, that it never could be their inclination, because not their interest, to have raised captious questions on its extent, or to have enfeebled privileges, which were the security of their own. Powers evident from necessity, and not suspicious from an alarming mode, or purpose of application, would, as formerly they were, be cheerfully submitted to ; and these would have been fully sufficient for the conservation of unity in the empire ; and for directing its wealth to one common centre. Another use has produced other consequences ; and a power, which refuses to be limited by its own moderation, must either be lost, or find other more distinct and satisfactory limitations. *As for us, a participation in arbitrary power would never reconcile our minds to it. We should be ashamed to stand before your Majesty boldly asserting inherent rights, which bind and regulate the crown itself, and yet insisting on the exercise in our own persons of a more arbitrary sway over our fellow-citizens*

*and fellow-freemen."* Such are some of the most leading passages in this eloquent and spirited remonstrance. To such of my readers as are acquainted with the style and manner of Junius, it will be unnecessary for me to offer any comments upon them. The only remark, which I shall make on the subject is, that this address not only resembles the style of the Letters, but, considering that it was intended to be presented to the King, is distinguished by as great a freedom of thinking, and as bold and dignified a spirit of remonstrance, as can be met with in almost any part of Junius. It was, therefore, as much with a view of convincing the reader of this last point, as to shew the similarity of style, that I made so many extracts from it.

Mr. Burke, finding, that he could not prevail on the minority, with whom he acted, to secede from parliament as he wished, or to carry up this address to the king, thought it his duty to lay the sentiments it contained more fully before the public, which he did accordingly, in a short time after, in his famous letter to the sheriffs of Bristol. This letter, being little more than the address in an expanded form, I find also that, like that, it has many features of resemblance to Junius. To these,

therefore, I mean, in the next place, to call the attention of my readers. “It affords no matter for very pleasing reflection, to observe, *that our subjects diminish, as our laws increase.*” This is the exact antithetic manner, that balancing and contrasting of the different parts of his sentences with one another, which, more than all other peculiarities, distinguish the style of Junius. If the reader has paid sufficient attention to them, he will find the same peculiarity in almost all the extracts which I have hitherto made from the writings of Mr. Burke. It will be equally evident in those to which I am now about to direct his attention. “I have no doubt, that we feel exactly the same emotions of grief and shame on all its (the American civil war) miserable consequences; whether they appear *on the one side, or the other, in the shape of victories, or defeats, of captures made from the English on the continent, or from the English in these islands; of legislature regulations, which subvert the liberties of our brethren, or undermine our own.*”—(Burke’s Works, vol. iii. p. 136.) Alluding to, and reprobating the construction, put by the ministry, on an act of the time of Henry VIII. for the trial in this kingdom of treasons committed out of the realm, which they meant to extend to America, he concludes a fine passage with these words:—

“ *Such a person (an American brought over to be tried in this country) may be executed according to form, but he can never be tried according to justice.*” (Ibid. p. 140.) And in the same page—“ If the English, in the colonies, can support the independency, to which they have been unfortunately driven, I suppose nobody has such a fanatical zeal for the criminal justice of Henry VIII. that he will contend for executions, which must be retaliated tenfold on his own friends; or who has conceived so strange an idea of English dignity, as to think the defeats in America compensated by the triumphs at Tyburn.”—“ Indeed our affairs are in a bad condition. I do assure those gentlemen, who have prayed for war, and obtained the blessing they have sought, that they are at this instant in very great straits. The abused wealth of this country continues a little longer to feed its distemper.—As yet they, and their German allies of twenty hireling states, have contended only with the unprepared strength of our infant colonies—But America is not subdued. Not one unattacked village, which was originally adverse throughout that vast continent, has yet submitted from love or terror. *You have the ground you encamp on; and you have no more. The cantonments of your troops and your dominions are exactly of the same*



*extent. You spread devastation, but you do not enlarge the sphere of authority."* (Ibid. p. 155.) "There are many circumstances in the zeal shown for civil war, which seem to discover but little of real magnanimity. The addressers offer their own persons, and they are satisfied with hiring Germans. They promise their private fortunes, and they mortgage their country. They have all the merit of volunteers, without risk of person, or charge of contribution. And when the unfeeling arm of a foreign soldiery pours out their kindred blood like water, they exult and triumph, as if they themselves had performed some notable exploit." (Ibid. p. 158.) "But the rebels looked for assistance from this country. They did so in the beginning of this controversy most certainly: and they sought it *by earnest supplications* to government, which *dignity rejected*, and by a *suspension of commerce*, which the *wealth of this nation enabled you to despise*. When they found that neither prayers nor menaces had any sort of weight, but that a firm resolution was taken to reduce them to unconditional obedience by a military force, they came to the last extremity. *Despairing of us, they trusted in themselves. Not strong enough themselves, they sought succour in France. In proportion as all encouragement here lessened, their*



*distance from this country increased. The encouragement is over ; the alienation is complete."* (Ibid. p. 172.) " They (the people of England) were not moved from their evident interest, by all these arts ; nor was it enough to tell them they were at war ; that they must go through with it ; and that the *cause* of the dispute was lost in the *consequences*. The people of England were then, as they are now, called upon to make government strong. They thought it a great deal better to make it wise and honest." (Ibid. p. 173.) " If such powers of treaty were to be wished whilst success was very doubtful, how came they to be less so, since his Majesty's arms have been crowned with many considerable advantages ? Have these successes induced us to alter our mind, as thinking the season of victory not the time for treating with honour or advantage ? Whatever changes have happened in the national character, it can scarcely be our wish, that *terms of accommodation never should be proposed to our enemy, except when they must be attributed solely to our fears*. It has happened, let me say, unfortunately, that *we read of his Majesty's commission for making peace, and his troops evacuating his last town in the thirteen provinces, at the same hour, and in the same gazette*. It was still more unfortunate that no

commission went to America to settle the troubles there until several months after an act had been passed to put the colonies out of the protection of this government, and to divide their trading property without a possibility of restitution, as spoil among the seamen of the navy—The most abject submission on the part of the colonies could not redeem them. There was no man on that whole continent, or within three thousand miles of it, qualified by law *to follow allegiance with protection, or submission with pardon.*" (Ibid. p. 175.) "I was persuaded that government was a practical thing made for the happiness of mankind, and not to furnish out a spectacle of uniformity to gratify the schemes of visionary politicians. *Our business was to rule, not to wrangle; and it would have been a poor compensation, that we had triumphed in a dispute, whilst we lost an empire.*" (Ibid. p. 183.)

In the dedication of the Letters of Junius the following passage occurs:—"If an honest, and, I may truly affirm, a laborious, zeal for the public service, has given me any weight in your esteem, let me exhort and conjure you never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by, without a determined, persevering re-

sistance.—One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact, to-day is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures ; and where they do not suit exactly, the defect is supplied by analogy. Be assured, that the laws which protect us in our civil rights, grow out of the constitution, and must fall, or flourish with it. This is not the cause of faction, or of party, or of any individual, but the common interest of every man in Britain.” If we compare this passage with the following in Mr. Burke’s *Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol*, we shall find some resemblance between them, not, indeed, in point of style, but in a certain degree of coincidence in the manner of thinking. “ I must add, that far from softening the features of such a principle, and thereby removing any part of the popular odium, or natural terrors attending it, I should be sorry that any thing framed in contradiction to the spirit of our constitution did not instantly produce, in fact, the grossest of the evils, with which it was pregnant in its nature. It is by lying dormant a long time, or being first very rarely exercised, that arbitrary power steals upon a people. On the next unconstitutional act, all the fashionable world will be ready to say : Your prophecies are ridiculous,

your fears are vain, you see how little of the mischiefs, which you formerly foreboded, are come to pass. *Thus, by degrees, that artful softening of all arbitrary power, the alledged infrequency, or narrow extent of its operation, will be received as a sort of aphorism.* And Mr. Hume will not be singular in telling us, that the felicity of mankind is no more disturbed by it, than by earthquakes, or thunder, or the other more unusual accidents of nature." (Works, vol. iii. p. 150.) There is also another passage in this Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol, the tendency of which is, in a great degree, similar to that, which has been just quoted from the Dedication to Junius. "*People without much difficulty admit the entrance of that injustice, of which they are not to be the immediate victims.*" \*\*\* "The alarm of such a proceeding would then be universal. It would operate as a sort of *call of the nation*. It would become every man's immediate and instant concern to be made very sensible of *the absolute necessity* of this total eclipse of liberty. They would more carefully advert to every renewal, and more powerfully resist it. These great determined measures are not commonly so dangerous to freedom—They are marked with two strong lines to slide into use. No plea, nor pretence

*of inconvenience or evil example (which must in their nature be daily and ordinary incidents) can be admitted as a reason for such mighty operations. But the true danger is, when liberty is nibbled away, for expedients, and by parts."* (Vol. iii. p. 146-7.)

Having already made so many extracts from Mr. Burke's Letter, though it contains many others calculated to confirm the opinion which it is my wish to establish, I shall now confine myself to one or two; nor shall I add any comments upon them. "What but that blindness of heart, which arises from the phrenzy of civil contention, could have made any persons conceive the present situation of the British affairs, as an object of triumph to themselves, or of congratulation to their sovereign? Nothing surely could be more lamentable to those, who remember the flourishing days of this kingdom, *than to see the insane joy of several unhappy people, amidst the sad spectacle which our affairs and conduct exhibit to the scorn of Europe.* We behold, (and it seems some people rejoice in beholding) our native land, which used to sit the envied arbiter of all her neighbours, reduced to a servile dependence on their mercy; *acquiescing in assurances of friendship, which she does not trust; complaining of*

*hostilities, which she dares not resent ; deficient to her allies ; lofty to her subjects, and submissive to her enemies ; whilst the liberal government of this free nation is supported by the hireling sword of German boors and vassals ; and three millions of the subjects of Great Britain are seeking for protection to English privileges in the arms of France."* (Ibid. p. 153.) The following is the last extract, which it is now my intention to make from this letter. " I scarcely know," says Mr. Burke, " how to adapt my mind to the feelings, with which the court gazettes mean to impress the people. It is not instantly, that I can be brought to rejoice, when I hear of the slaughter and captivity of long lists of those names, which have been familiar to my ears from my infancy, and to rejoice, that they have fallen under the sword of strangers, *whose barbarous appellations I scarcely know how to pronounce. The glory acquired, at the White Plains, by colonel Raille, has no charms for me ; and I fairly acknowledge, that I have not yet learned to delight in finding Fort Kniphausen in the heart of the British dominions.*" (Ibid. p. 154.)

Although this passage was written in 1777, I think, that several of my readers will not be disinclined to think with me, that it was dictated by the same mind, which produced the



following, nine years before, that is in 1768. It is the beginning of one of the miscellaneous letters of Junius, which he addressed, on the 19th of July, that year, to the printer of the Public Advertiser. "The spirit, which once animated the London Gazette, seems to have expired with the war. The learned compiler of that paper was blest with a genius equal to the description of battles and victories, but could not descend with dignity to the pacific annals of domestic economy. *While our troops were sacrificed abroad, his pen was employed, with equal bravery, in murdering our language at home. He never lost a consonant from the Elbe to the Weaser, or mollified one circumstance in all the guttural pomp of a German campaign.*" (Vol. iii. p. 63.

Nor is this the only instance, in which Burke and Junius agree with respect to the employment of a hireling German soldiery. Neither of them ever touches upon the subject, but in terms expressive of abhorrence, contempt, or indignation\*. (See his Works, vol. iii. p. 203, 157-8; 167, 8, 9, &c. and p. 52, 3, 4, of this Inquiry.)

\* The writer of a sketch of Mr. Burke's Life, after quoting the above passage from the Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol, adds the following remark upon it. "In other instances, as often



As it is probable, that those critics, who maintain, that Mr. Burke could not write in the style and manner of Junius, will not be very easily convinced, I shall proceed to lay before them some further extracts, in order to weaken their confidence in the solidity of that favourite opinion. Will they maintain, that the following passage has no resemblance to the writings of Junius, where Mr. Burke, remarking on the American policy of Lord North, says, towards the end of his speech on American taxation : “ How we have fared since then—what woeful variety of schemes have been adopted ; what enforcing, and what repealing ; what bullying and what submitting ; what doing and undoing ; what straining and what relaxing ; what assemblies dissolving for not obeying, and called again without obedience ; what troops sent out to quell resistance, and, on meeting that resistance, recalled ; *what shiftings and changes, and jumbings, of all kinds of men at home, which left no possibility of order, consistency, vigour, or even so much as a decent unity of colour in any one public measure.* It is a tedious

as he touched on German mercenaries, his warmth kindled into indignation, his passions flew to arms, and, in the conflict, it was seldom that the petty princes of Germany themselves escaped with a string of epithets as long as their titles.”

irksome task--my duty may call me to open it out some other time. \*\*\* For the present I shall forbear."

The constant and repeated changes of the ministry, alluded to in the conclusion of the above extract, as well as their own private dissensions, squabbles, and animosities, were made frequent objects of censure, invective and ridicule, both by Burke and Junius. Burke, in his ironical answer to his own *short account of a late short administration*, says: "But the main design of my taking pen in hand was to refute the silly author of a late silly publication, called *a short Account of a late short Administration*. This half-sheet accomptant shows his ill humour in the very title: he calls one year and twenty days a *short* administration; whereas I can prove, by the *Rule of Three Direct*, that it is as much as any ministry in these times has a right to expect. Since the happy accession of his present Majesty to this day, we have worn out no less than five complete sets of honest, able, upright ministers, not to speak of the present, whom God long preserve! First, we had Mr. Pitt's administration; next, the Duke of Newcastle's; then, Lord Bute's; then, Mr. Grenville's; and lastly, my Lord Rockingham's. Now, sir, if you take

a bit of chalk and reckon from the seventh of Oct. 1760, to the 13th of July, 1766, you will find five years, nine months, and thirty days ! which divided by *five*, the total of administrations, gives exactly one year and sixty days each, *on an average*, as we say in the city, and one day more, if they have the good fortune to serve in leap year." He also remarks in the same letter, alluding to the patchwork ministry then formed by Lord Chatham, "He has once more deigned to take the reins of government in his own hand, and will, no doubt, drive with his wonted speed, and raise a deal of dust around him. His horses are all matched to his mind ; but, as some of them are young and skittish, it is said he has adopted the new contrivance lately exhibited by Sir Francis Delaval, on Westminster Bridge ; whenever they begin to snort and toss up their heads, he touches the spring, throws them loose, and away they go, leaving his Lordship safe and snug, and as much at his ease as if he sat on a wool-pack." The admirable picture, which he drew of the same ministry, eight years after, (in 1774), will never be forgotten. "He (Lord Chatham) made an administration, so chequered and speckled ; he put together a piece of joinery, so crossly indented and whimsically dovetailed ; a cabinet so variously inlaid ; such a

piece of diversified mosaic; such a tessellated pavement without cement—here a bit of black stone, and there a bit of white; patriots and courtiers; king's friends and republicans; whigs and tories; treacherous friends and open enemies; that it was, indeed, a very curious shew, but utterly unsafe to touch, and unsound to stand on. The colleagues, whom he had assorted at the same boards, stared at each other, and were obliged to ask, 'Sir, your name? Sir you have the advantage of me. Mr. Such-a-one, I beg a thousand pardons.' I venture to say, it did so happen, that persons had a single office divided between them, who had never spoken to each other in their lives; until they found themselves, they knew not how, pigging together, heads and points, in the same truckle-bed.'

If we now turn our attention to Junius, we shall find, that this subject attracted his notice, as often as that of Mr. Burke. Speaking of the duration of parliament in his dedication, he remarks: "If you reflect, *that in the changes of administration, which have marked and disgraced the present reign* \*, although your warmest patriots have, in

\* The following short statement will shew, that Burke and Junius had some reason for the severity with which they uniformly commented on this subject. "From the time, that

their turn, been invested with the lawful and unlawful authority of the crown, &c." (Vol. i. p. 7.) And in his first letter—" *After a rapid succession of changes, we are reduced to that state, which hardly any change can mend.*" And again; "The palm of ministerial firmness is now transferred to Lord North. He tells us so himself, with the plenitude of the *ore rotundo*; and I am ready enough to believe, that, while he can keep his place, he will not easily be persuaded to resign it. *Your Grace was the firm minister of yesterday; Lord North is the firm minister of to-day; to-morrow, perhaps, his Majesty, in his wisdom, may give us a rival for you both.*" (Vol. ii. p. 102.) Alluding to the Chatham ministry, so severely ridiculed by Mr. Burke, Junius remarks, that—"The blindness of chance has done more for the painter, than the warmest fancy could have imagined, and has brought together such a group of figures, as, I believe, never appeared in real life, or on canvass, be-

the Rt. Hon. Henry Bilson Legge was discharged from the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, in May 1761, and Lord Temple and Mr. Pitt resigned the 18th of September that year, *no less than 523 changes of places, outs and ins, happened,* (up to the time of the Rockingham administration,) by the fluctuating of ministerial influence; a circumstance hardly to be paralleled in any annals." (Sketch of the Life, &c. of Mr. Burke.)

fore \*." (Vol. ii. p. 471.) This and the following passage, though different in the expression, are in the same spirit with that cited above from the speech on American taxation. "The uncertain state of politics in this country sets all the speculations of the press at defiance. *To talk of modern ministers, or to examine their conduct, would be to reason without data* ; for, whether it be owing to the real simple innocence of doing nothing, or to a happy mysteriousness in concealing their activity, *we know as little of the services they have performed, since it became their lot to appear in the Gazette, as we did of their persons or characters before. They seem to have*

\* This extract is taken from one of his miscellaneous Letters, signed *Correggio*, in which he sketches a design for Lord Towshend, (who, he says, was fond of painting) in order to enable him to give a more finished portrait of all the leading Cabinet Ministers of that time. To do Junius justice, his design is certainly sketched with much severity, boldness, satire, and ability. It deserves to be remarked here, that no man can be supposed more likely to have written such a letter than Mr. Burke, whom Sir Joshua Reynolds declared the best judge of painting he ever knew.—Allusions to the language of painting, and metaphors drawn from that source, are common in the writings of Junius and of Burke. "Struck with the principal figure, we do not sufficiently mark in what manner the canvass is filled up." (Junius, vol. ii. p. 35.) "As a part of this system, and in order to *give it due roundness and relief*, it was thought proper, &c." (Vol. iii. p. 100.) "Reformation is one of those pieces which must be put at some distance in order to please." (Burke, vol. iii. p. 235.)



*come together by a sort of fortuitous concourse, and have hitherto done nothing else but jumble and jostle one another, without being able to settle into any one regular, or consistent figure. I am not, however, such an atheist in politics, as to suppose, that there is not somewhere an original creating cause, which drew these atoms forth into existence; but it seems the utmost skill and cunning of that secret governing hand could go no farther.” (Vol. ii. p. 465.) “ Since the accession of our most gracious sovereign to the throne, we have seen a system of government, which may well be called a reign of experiments. Parties of all denominations have been employed and dismissed. The advice of the ablest men in this country has been repeatedly called for and rejected; and when the Royal displeasure has been signified to a minister, the marks of it have usually been proportioned to his abilities and integrity. The spirit of the favourite had some apparent influence upon every administration; and every set of ministers preserved an appearance of duration, as long as they submitted to that influence. But there were certain services to be performed for the Favourite’s security, or to gratify his resentments, which your predecessors in office had the wisdom or the virtue not to undertake. The moment this refractory spirit*



*was discovered, their disgrace was determined. Lord Chatham, Mr. Grenville, and Lord Rockingham have successively had the honour to be dismissed for preferring their duty, as servants of the public, to those compliances, which were expected from their station. A submissive administration was at last gradually collected from the deserters of all parties, interests, and connections ; and nothing remained but to find a leader for these gallant, well-disciplined troops.”* (Junius, vol. i. p. 166.) If I do not deceive myself egregiously it will strike the mind of every candid scholar, as highly probable, that the above passage from Junius, and the following from the works of Mr. Burke, were written by the same hand. “As a foundation of their scheme, the cabal have established a sort of *rota* in the court. All sorts of parties, by this means, have been brought into administration, from whence few have had the good fortune to escape without disgrace ; none at all without considerable losses. In the beginning of each arrangement no professions of confidence and support are wanting to induce the leading men to engage. But while the ministers of the day appear in all the pomp and pride of power, while they have all their canvass spread out to the wind, and every sail filled with the fair and

prosperous gale of Royal favour, in a short time they find, they know not how, a current, which sets directly against them; which prevents all progress, and even drives them backwards. They grow ashamed and mortified in a situation, which by its vicinity to power, only serves to remind them the more strongly of their insignificance. They are obliged either to execute the orders of their inferiors, or to see themselves opposed by the natural instruments of their office. With the loss of their dignity, they lose their temper. In their turn they grow troublesome to that Cabal, which, whether it supports, or opposes, equally disgraces and equally betrays them. *It is soon found necessary to get rid of the heads of administration; but it is of the heads only, as there always are many rotten members belonging to the best connections, it is not hard to persuade several to continue in office without their leaders.* By this means the party goes out much thinner than it came in; and is only reduced in strength by its temporary possession of power."

Let us now turn our attention to what they say about the broken, distracted councils, and private disagreements of the ministry. I have, in an early part of this inquiry, quoted a pas-

sage from Mr. Burke, in which he says, "*that disconnection and confusion in office, in parties, in families, in parliament, in the nation, prevail beyond the disorders of any former time.*"

The following extract, on the same topic, is taken from a speech, which he made in the House of Commons, on the 24th of November, 1767. "I readily agree, that there is a cause of discord somewhere: where it is I will not pretend to say. That it does exist is certain; and I much doubt, whether it is likely to be removed by any measures taken by the present administration. As to vague and general recommendations to us to maintain unanimity amongst us, I must say I think they are become of late years too flat and stale to bear being repeated. That such are the kind sentiments and wishes of our monarch I am far from doubting; but, when I consider it as the language of the minister, as a minister's recommendation, I cannot help thinking it a vain and idle parade of words without meaning. *Is it in their own conduct that we are to look for an example of this boasted union? Shall we discover any trace of it in their broken, distracted councils, their public disagreements, and private animosities? Is it not notorious, that they subsist only by creating divisions among others? That their plan is to separate*

*party from party ; friend from friend ; brother from brother ?* Is not their very motto, *Divide et impera ?* When such men advise us to unite, what opinion must we have of their sincerity ?"—Such were the sentiments of Mr. Burke. Let us now attend to those of Junius on the same subject, and, I am persuaded, that we shall find the coincidence of opinion as complete as could be expected.—“ They (the ministry) persuade him (the king) to do what is properly their business, and desert him in the midst of it. Yet this is an inconvenience to which he must for ever be exposed, while he adheres to a ministry *divided among themselves*, or unequal in credit and ability to the great task they have undertaken.” (Vol. ii. p. 130.) Junius, in 1767, sent to the Public Advertiser a very severe and humorous account of what passed at a meeting of the privy council at Lord Shelburne’s, called for the purpose of giving instructions to the Lord Lieutenant (Lord Townshend) then appointed to the government of Ireland. The letter is in the form of a dialogue, and possesses considerable merit. He introduces Lord Northington, (or Tilbury,) in one part, saying to Malagrida, (Lord Shelburne), “ No, damn me, ’tis a little too late, I thank you. *Aside.* This silly puppy takes me for his schoolmaster, and fancies I am obliged

to hear him repeat his task to me." *Exit. Sulky*, (Lord Towshend), is represented as uttering what follows. *Aside*. "What the devil shall I do now? A sick man might as well expect to be cured by a consultation of quack doctors; *they talk, and debate, and wrangle, and the patient expires.*" Malagrida, *solus*, speaking of his colleagues in office, concludes the dialogue in the following words:—"What a negro's skin must I have, if this shallow fellow could see my meaning in my face!—Now will I skulk away to ———, *where I will betray, or misrepresent every syllable I have heard, ridicule their persons, blacken their characters, and fawn upon the man who hears me, until I have an opportunity of biting even him to the heart.*" *Exit*. (Junius, vol. ii. p. 490, 1, 2.) In a subsequent letter on the same subject, he has these words: "But the facts, of which the public are already possessed, sufficiently speak for themselves, and the nation wants no further proof of the weakness, ignorance, irresolution, and spirit of discord, which reign triumphant in this illustrious divan, who have dared to take upon them the conduct of an empire." (Vol. ii. p. 497.) "When the fate of Great Britain (says he in another place) is thrown upon the hazard of a die, by a weak, distracted, worthless ministry, an

honest man will always express all the indignation he feels." (Vol. iii. p. 74.) In one of his letters, signed *Atticus*, he gives the following character of the ministry. "The school they were bred in taught them how to abandon their friends, without deserting their principles. There is a littleness even in their ambition; for money is their first object. Their professed opinions upon some great points are so different from those of the party, with which they are now united, *that the council chamber is become a scene of open hostilities.* While the fate of Great Britain is at stake, *these worthy counsellors dispute without decency, advise without sincerity, resolve without decision, and leave the measure to be executed by the man who voted against it.* This, I conceive, *is the last disorder of the state.* The consultation meets but to disagree. Opposite medicines are prescribed, and the last fixed on is changed by the hand that gives it." (Vol. iii. p. 175.) And in another letter under the same signature: "We are arrived at that point, when new taxes either produce nothing, or defeat the old ones; and when new duties only operate as a prohibition: Yet these are the times, sir, when every ignorant boy thinks himself fit to be a minister. Instead of attendance to objects of national importance, our worthy governors are contented to divide



their time between private pleasures and ministerial intrigues. Their activity is just equal to the persecution of a prisoner in the King's Bench, and to the honourable struggle of providing for their dependents. If there be a good man in the King's service they dismiss him of course ; and, when bad news arrives, instead of uniting to consider of a remedy, *their time is spent in accusing and reviling one another. Thus the debate concludes in some half, misbegotten measure, which is left to execute itself.—Away they go:—one retires to his country house ; another is engaged at a horse-race ; a third has an appointment with a prostitute ; and, as to their country, they leave her, like a cast-off mistress, to perish under the diseases they have given her.*" (Vol. iii. p. 97.)

There are several other passages in the works of both these writers of the same tendency, which I shall abstain from quoting, in order to avoid unnecessary prolixity. Let us again return to such extracts as prove a similarity of style : and I must, by the way, remark, should my extracts on this subject appear, to some of my readers, too long, or too numerous, that my reason for multiplying them is a desire to settle this point fully, knowing, as I do, that the alledged diversity



of his style has been the most hacknied argument against the claims of Mr. Burke, and being convinced, from my own experience, that passages, which may carry conviction to one mind, will often have no influence, at all, upon another. I hope, and wish, therefore, by making a large selection of extracts to have it in my power to give some satisfaction to all.

The concluding lines of the first paragraph of the speech on American taxation remind me of the style of Junius:—"For nine long years, session after session, we have been lashed round and round this miserable circle of occasional arguments and temporary expedients. I am sure our heads must turn, and our stomachs nauseate with them. We have had them in every shape ; we have looked at them in every point of view. *Invention is exhausted ; reason is fatigued ; experience has given judgment ; but obstinacy is not yet conquered.*" Farther on, in the same speech, he asks : "Do you, after this, wonder, that you have no weight and no respect in the colonies ? after this, are you surprised, that parliament is every day and every where losing, (I feel it with sorrow, I utter it with reluctance,) that reverential affection, which so endearing a name of authority ought ever to

carry with it ; that you are obeyed solely from respect to the bayonet ; and that this House, the ground and pillar of freedom, is itself held up only by the treacherous under-pinning and clumsy buttresses of arbitrary power ?”

The two paragraphs, which follow this, have a good deal of the spirited and antithetic manner of Junius. In other parts of the same speech, we find many others of the same kind, such as the following, which I quote, by preference, on account of their comparative brevity. “ I am not called upon to enlarge, to you, on that danger, which you thought proper yourselves to aggravate and to display to the world, with all the parade of indiscreet declamation. The monopoly of the most lucrative trades, and the possession of imperial revenues, had brought you to the verge of beggary and ruin—Such was your representation—such, in some measure, was your case.” “ You are, therefore, at this moment in the awkward situation of fighting for a phantom ; a quiddity ; a thing that wants, not only a substance, but even a name ; for a thing, *which is neither abstract right, nor profitable enjoyment.*” “ They tell you, sir, that your dignity is tied to it.—I know not how it happens, but this dignity of yours is a terrible

incumbrance to you ; for it has of late been ever at war with your interest, your equity, and every idea of your policy. Show the thing you contend for to be reason ; show it to be common sense ; show it to be the means of attaining some useful end, and then I am content to allow it what dignity you please. *But what dignity is derived from the perseverance in absurdity is more than ever I could discern."*

I quote the following passages, not to prove similarity of style, but to show, that both writers frequently drew their metaphors from the same, or similar sources. " This vermin of court reporters, (says Burke) when they are forced into day upon one point, are sure to *burrow* in another ; but they shall have no refuge : I will make them *bolt out of all their holes.*" " I have, you see, sir, (says Junius) not meddled with his private character ; (the Duke of Grafton's) I leave that for him *to earth in whenever he is hard run*, according to the laudable example of his chancellor of the exchequer." (Vol. iii. p. 25.) " I should be ashamed (says Mr. Burke) to make myself one of a noisy multitude *to halloo and hearten* them into doubtful and dangerous courses." " If all the world joined them in *a full cry* against rebellion," &c. " I departed from those limits in pursuit of a

principle; and *following the same game in its doubles*, I am brought into those limits again."

These are taken from the third volume of Burke's works. It would be easy for me to multiply instances were it necessary. The following, among others, occur in Junius. "At any rate the broker should *be run down*. That at least is due to his master." "If no prescription is pleadable against the crown, and if the treasury, without hearing, is suffered, at pleasure, to *halloo an informer at your estate*," &c. "*The old Fox has been unkennelled, but is ashamed of his stinking tail*." This is the first sentence of a letter, which he addressed to the Right Hon. Edward Weston.

The following extract from the speech on American taxation is in the manner of Junius. "If you do not fall in with the motion, then secure something to fight for consistent in theory and valuable in practice. If you must employ your strength, employ it to uphold you in some honourable right, or some profitable wrong. If you are apprehensive, that the concession recommended to you, though proper, should be a means of drawing on you farther, but unreasonable claims; why then employ your force in

supporting that reasonable concession against those unreasonable demands."

Towards the conclusion of his letter to the sheriffs of Bristol, Mr. Burke, whilst combating an opinion at that time industriously circulated by the court party, that all public men were alike, all equally venal and corrupt, has some remarks, which coincide pretty closely with the opinions maintained in one of the letters of Junius. "The age unquestionably produces daring profligates and insidious hypocrites. What then? *Am I not to avail myself of whatever good is to be found in the world, because of the mixture of evil that will always be in it? The smallness of the quantity in currency only heightens the value\**. They, who raise suspicions on the good, on account of the behaviour of bad men, are of the party of the latter." "I am aware, that the age is not what we all wish. But I am sure, that the only means of checking its precipitate degeneracy, is heartily to concur with whatever is the best in our time; and to have some more correct standard of judging what that best is,

\* In his Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs I find the following remark, partly to the same effect. "It is not worth our while to discuss, like sophisters, whether, in no case, some evil, for the sake of some benefit, is to be tolerated."

than *the transient and uncertain favour of a court*. If once we are able to find, and can prevail on ourselves to strengthen an union of such men, whatever accidentally becomes indisposed to ill-exercised power, even by the ordinary operation of human passions, must join with that society, and cannot long be joined without in some degree assimilating to it. Virtue will catch, as well as vice, by contact; and the public stock of honest manly principle will daily accumulate. *We are not too nicely to scrutinize motives, as long as action is irreproachable*. It is enough, (and for a worthy man perhaps too much) to deal out its infamy to convicted guilt and declared apostasy." (Works, vol. iii. p. 201.) The following extracts are taken from the letter, in which Junius recommends union among the friends of the people. It is dated on the 5th of October, 1771. "Let us try whether these fatal dissensions may not yet be reconciled: or, if that be impracticable, let us guard at least against the worst effects of division; and endeavour to persuade these furious partisans, if they will not consent to draw together, to be separately useful to that cause which they all pretend to be attached to." "Let us employ these men in whatever departments their various abilities are best suited to, and as much to the advantage of



the common cause, as their different inclinations will permit. They cannot serve us without essentially serving themselves." "As for differences of opinion upon speculative questions, if we wait till they are reconciled, the action of human affairs must be suspended for ever. *But neither are we to look for perfection in any one man, nor for agreement among many.*" "Let us take mankind as they are: let us distribute the virtues and abilities of individuals according to the offices they affect; and when they quit the service, let us endeavour to supply their places with better men than we have lost." "I will not reject a bill, which tends to confine parliamentary privilege within reasonable bounds, though it should be stolen from the house of Cavendish, and introduced by Mr. Onslow. The features of the infant are a proof of the descent, and vindicate the noble birth from the baseness of the adoption. I willingly accept of a sarcasm from colonel Barré, or a simile from Mr. Burke. Even the silent vote of Mr. Calcraft is worth reckoning in a division. What though he riots in the plunder of the army, and has only determined to be a patriot, when he could not be a peer? *Let us profit by the assistance of such men while they are with us; and place them, if it be possible, in the post of danger*

to prevent desertion." "*We should not generally reject the friendship, or services of any man, because he differs from us in a particular opinion.* This will not appear a superfluous caution, if we observe the ordinary conduct of mankind. In public affairs, there is the least chance of a perfect concurrence of sentiment, or inclination; yet every man is able to contribute something to the common stock, and no man's contribution should be rejected. *If individuals have no virtue, their vices may be of use to us. I care not with what principle the new-born patriot is animated, if the measures he supports are beneficial to the community. The nation is interested in his conduct; his motives are his own.*" The coincidence of opinion in these passages is so manifest, as to require no comment, or illustration.

The introduction of these occasional specimens of a coincidence in thinking, besides their direct tendency to prove identity of authorship, will serve, in some measure, to lessen the tediousness of the detail, into which I have deemed it necessary to enter on the subject of style. To this, however, I must again return.—“ These artifices of a desperate cause are, at this time, spread abroad, with incredible care, in every part of the town, from the highest to the lowest com-

panies; *as if the industry of the circulation were to make amends for the absurdity of the report.*" The following specimens are taken from his speech on American conciliation. "I would, sir, recommend to your serious consideration, whether it be prudent to form a rule for punishing people, *not on their own acts, but on your conjectures?* Surely it is preposterous at the very best. *It is not justifying your anger, by their misconduct; but it is converting your ill-will into their delinquency.*" (Vol. iii. p. 80). "In this assurance my mind most perfectly acquiesces; and I confess, *I feel not the least alarm, from the discontents which are to arise, from putting people at their ease;* nor do I apprehend the destruction of this empire, from giving, by an act of free grace and indulgence, to two millions of my fellow citizens, some share of those rights, upon which I have always been taught to value myself." (Ibid. p. 112). "Permit me to observe, that the use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment; but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again; and a nation is not governed, which is perpetually to be conquered. My next objection is its uncertainty. Terror is not always the effect of force; and an armament is not a victory. If you do not succeed, you are without resource; for, con-

ciliation failing, force remains; but, force failing, no further hope of reconciliation is left. *Power and authority are sometimes bought by kindness; but they can never be begged as alms, by an impoverished and defeated violence.* “Lastly, we have no sort of experience in favour of force, as an instrument in the rule of our colonies. Their growth and their utility have been owing to methods altogether different. Our ancient indulgence has been said to be pursued to a fault. It may be so. *But we know, if feeling is evidence, that our fault was more tolerable, than our attempt to mend it; and our sin far more salutary, than our penitence.*” (Ibid. p. 47-8). “To restore order and repose to an empire so great and so distracted as ours, is, merely in the attempt, an undertaking, that would ennoble the flights of the highest genius, and obtain pardon for the efforts of the meanest understanding.” (Ibid. p. 30). “Great and acknowledged force is not impaired, either in effect, or in opinion, by an unwillingness to exert itself. The superior power may offer peace, with honour and with safety. Such an offer from such a power will be attributed to magnanimity. But the concessions of the weak are the concessions of fear. When such a one is disarmed, he is wholly at the mercy of his superior; and he loses for ever that time and

those chances, which, as they happen to all men, are the strength and resources of all inferior power." (Ibid. p. 34). "It will show you, that it is not to be considered as one of those *minima*, which are out of the eye and consideration of the law; not a paltry excrescence of the state; not a mean dependant, *who may be neglected with little damage, and provoked with little danger*. It will prove, that some degree of care and caution is required in the handling of such an object; it will show, that you ought not, in reason, to trifle with so large a mass of the interests and feelings of the human race. *You could at no time do so without guilt; and be assured you will not be able to do it long with impunity.*" (Ibid. p. 36). "For, in order to prove, that the Americans have no right to their liberties, we are every day endeavouring to subvert the maxims, which preserve the whole spirit of our own. To prove, that the Americans ought not to be free, we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself; and we never seem to gain a paltry advantage over them in debate, without attacking some of those principles, for which our ancestors have shed their blood." (Ibid. p. 61). But, when I consider that we have colonies for no purpose but to be serviceable to us, it seems to my poor understanding *a little preposterous, to make them*

*unserviceable, in order to keep them obedient.*

It is, in truth, nothing more, than the old, and, as I thought, exploded problem of tyranny, which proposes to beggar its subjects into submission. But, remember, when you have completed your system of impoverishment, that nature still proceeds in her ordinary course; that discontent will increase with misery; and that there are critical moments in the fortune of all states, *when they, who are too weak to contribute to your prosperity, may be strong enough to complete your ruin.*" (Ibid. p. 65). "The army, by which we must govern in their place, would be far more chargeable to us; not quite so effectual: and, perhaps, in the end, full as difficult to be kept in obedience." (Ibid. p. 67). "It is sometimes as hard to persuade slaves to be free, as it is to compel freemen to be slaves; and, in this auspicious scheme, we should have both these pleasing tasks on our hands, at once. But, when we talk of enfranchisement, do we not perceive, that the American master may enfranchise too; and arm servile hands in defence of freedom? A measure to which other people have had recourse more than once, and not without success, in a desperate situation of their affairs." (Ibid. p. 67). "An offer of freedom from England would come rather oddly, shipped to them in an African



vessel, which is refused an entry into the ports of Virginia, or Carolina, with a cargo of three hundred Angola Negroes. It would be curious to see the Guinea captain attempting at the same instant to publish his proclamation of liberty, and to advertise his sale of slaves." (Ibid. p. 68). "I am not ripe to pass sentence on the gravest public bodies, entrusted with magistracies of great authority and dignity, and charged with the safety of their fellow-citizens, upon the very same title that I am. *I really think, that, for wise men, this is not judicious ; for sober men, not decent ; for minds tinctured with humanity, not mild and merciful.*" (Ibid. p. 69). "Will not this, sir, very soon teach the provinces to make no distinctions on their part? *Will it not teach them, that the government, against which a claim of liberty is tantamount to high-treason, is a government, to which submission is equivalent to slavery?* It may not always be quite convenient to impress dependent communities with such an idea." (Ibid. p. 70). "In this situation let us seriously and coolly ponder. *What is it we have got by all our menaces, which have been many and ferocious? What advantage have we derived from the penal laws we have passed, and which, for the time, have been severe and numerous? What advances have we made towards our object,*

by the sending of a force, which, by land and sea, is no contemptible strength? Has the disorder abated? Nothing less.—When I see things in this situation, after such confident hopes, bold promises, and active exertions, I cannot, for my life, avoid a suspicion, that the plan itself is not correctly right.” (Ibid. p. 72). “The question with me is not, whether you have a right to render your people miserable; but whether it is not your interest to make them happy. It is not, what a lawyer tells me, I may do; but what humanity, reason, and justice, tell me I ought to do. Is a politic act the worse for being a generous one? Is no concession proper, but that which is made from your want of right to keep what you grant? Or does it lessen the grace, or dignity of relaxing in the exercise of an odious claim, because you have your evidence-room full of titles, and your magazines stuffed with arms to enforce them? Of what avail are they, when the reason of the thing tells me, that the assertion of my title is the loss of my suit; and that I could do nothing, but wound myself by the use of my own weapons?” (Ibid. p. 75). “Then, sir, you keep up revenue laws, which are mischievous, in order to preserve trade laws, that are useless. Such is the wisdom of our plan in both its members. They are separately given up as of no value, and yet one is always to

be defended for the sake of the other." (Ibid. p. 78). "But the colonies will go farther.—Alas! alas! when will this speculating against fact and reason end? *What will quiet these panic fears, which we entertain of the hostile effect of a conciliatory conduct?* Is it true, that no case can exist, in which it is proper for the sovereign to accede to the desires of his discontented subjects? Is there any thing peculiar in this case to make a rule for itself? *Is all authority of course lost, when it is not pushed to the extreme?* Is it a certain maxim, that, the fewer causes of dissatisfaction are left by government, the more the subject will be inclined to resist and rebel?" (Ibid. p. 80). "The question now, on all this accumulated matter, is—*Whether you will choose to abide by a profitable experience, or a mischievous theory; whether you choose to build on imagination, or fact; whether you prefer enjoyment, or hope; satisfaction in your subjects, or discontent?*" (Ibid. p. 103) "The march of the human mind is slow. Sir, it was not, until after two hundred years, discovered, that, by an eternal law, *Providence had decreed vexation to violence, and poverty to rapine.* Your ancestors did, however, at length, open their eyes to the ill-husbandry of injustice. They found, that the tyranny of a free people

could, of all tyrannies, the least be endured; and that laws made against an whole nation were not the most effectual methods for securing its obedience." (Ibid. p. 86). " All communication is cut off between us, but this we know with certainty, that, though we cannot reclaim them, we may reform ourselves. If measures of peace are necessary, they must begin somewhere; and a conciliatory temper must precede and prepare every plan of reconciliation. Nor do I conceive, that we suffer any thing, by thus regulating our own minds—we are not disarmed, by being disencumbered of our passions. Declaiming on rebellion never added a bayonet, or a charge of powder to your military force; but I am afraid, that it has been the means of taking up many muskets against you." (Ibid. p. 162). " It is no excuse for presumptuous ignorance, that it is directed by insolent passion. The poorest being that crawls the earth, contending to save itself from injustice and oppression, is an object respectable in the eyes of God and man. But I cannot conceive any existence under heaven, (which, in the depths of its wisdom, tolerates all sorts of things), that is more truly odious and disgusting, than an impotent helpless creature, without civil wisdom, or military skill, without a consciousness of any other qualification for power,

but his servility to it, bloated with pride and arrogance, calling for battles, which he is not to fight, contending for a violent dominion, which he can never exercise, and satisfied to be himself mean and miserable, in order to render others contemptible and wretched.”—“ If you and I find our talents not of the great and ruling kind, our conduct, at least, is conformable to our faculties. No man’s life pays the forfeit of our rashness. No desolate widow weeps tears of blood over our ignorance. Scrupulous and sober in a well-grounded distrust of ourselves, we would keep in the port of peace and security; and, perhaps, in recommending to others something of the same diffidence, *we should show ourselves more charitable to their welfare, than injurious to their abilities.*” (Ibid. p. 156-7).

Having undertaken to show, that Mr. Burke frequently wrote in the style and manner of Junius, I am of opinion, that I shall establish that point better, by making extracts from several of his writings, than I could do, were I to confine myself to a more partial and limited selection. This, I hope, will be a sufficient apology for the length, and tediousness of this deduction, at least to some of my readers; but for the satisfaction of those, who may happen to be more

difficult to be pleased, I shall state here, that they may expect proofs of a more palpable kind in a subsequent part of this inquiry. In Mr. Burke's letter to Samuel Span, Esq. in April 1778, I find the following passages, which have something of the manner of Junius—"If I had not considered the present resolutions merely as preparatory to better things, and as a means of showing experimentally, *that justice to others is not always folly to ourselves*, I should have contented myself with receiving them in a cold and silent acquiescence."—"We cannot be insensible of the calamities, which have been brought upon this nation, by an obstinate adherence to narrow and restrictive plans of government. I confess, I cannot prevail on myself *to take them up, precisely at a time, when the most decisive experience has taught the rest of the world to lay them down.*" "I find that we are still disposed to talk at our ease, and as if all things were to be regulated by our good pleasure. I should consider it as a fatal symptom, if, in our present *distressed and adverse circumstances*, we should persist in the errors which are natural only to prosperity. One cannot, indeed, sufficiently lament the continuance of that spirit of delusion, by which, for a long time past, we have thought fit *to measure our necessities by our inclinations.* Moderation,



*prudence, and equity are far more suitable to our condition, than loftiness and confidence and rigour. We are threatened by enemies of no small magnitude, whom, if we think fit, we may despise, as we have despised others; but they are enemies, who can only cease to be truly formidable, by our entertaining a due respect for their power. Our danger will not be lessened by our shutting our eyes to it; nor will our force abroad be increased, by rendering ourselves feeble and divided at home."*

The following extract from Mr. Burke's speech on the civil list debt (in April, 1777) will, I think, be allowed, by good judges at least, to be strongly marked with the features of Junius. "They have plunged us into a dreadful war, which has already cost the nation twenty millions of money. They have severed the empire, destroyed our commerce, sunk the revenue, and given a mortal blow to public credit. We have lost thirteen flourishing and growing provinces, some of which were already, in point of importance, if not of power, nearly equal to ancient kingdoms: and we are now engaged in a destructive and helpless attempt *to recover, by force, what our folly and violence have lost.* Is this then a season, when we shall be under a necessity of taxing every gentleman's house in England, even to the smallest domestic

accommodation, and to accumulate burden upon burden on a people already sinking under the load, to come and tell us, that we have not hitherto made a provision for the crown adequate to its grandeur, and that we must now find new funds for the increase of its splendour? *Is the real lustre, which it has unhappily lost, to be supplied by the false glare of profusion? And the ostensive expenses of government to increase in a due proportion to its poverty and weakness? It will be a new discovery in the policy of nations, that the only means of replacing the loss of half an empire is by the boundless prodigality of the remainder.*" Eight years before Mr. Burke published the following remarks on this topic: "There is an opinion universal, that these revenues (the King's foreign ones) produce something not inconsiderable, clear of all charges and establishments. This produce the people do not believe to be hoarded, nor perceive to be spent. It is accounted for in the only manner it can, by supposing, that it is drawn away, for the support of that court faction, which, whilst it distresses the nation, impoverishes the Prince in every one of his resources." \*\*\* He proceeds to remark, how little advantage the Monarch has derived from this system of favouritism—"which, without magnificence, has sunk him into a state of unnatural

poverty ; at the same time that he possessed every means of affluence, from ample revenues, both in this country and in other parts of his dominions.”

“ Then what has the Crown, or the King, profited by all this fine-wrought scheme ? Is he more rich, or more splendid, or more powerful, or more at his ease, by so many labours and contrivances ? *Have they not beggared his Exchequer, tarnished the splendour of his court, sunk his dignity, galled his feelings, and discomposed the whole order and happiness of his private life ?*”—“ Suppose then we were to ask, whether the King has been richer than his predecessors, in accumulated wealth, since the establishment of the plan of favouritism ? I believe it will be found, *that the picture of royal indigence, which our court has presented until this year, has been truly humiliating ; nor has it been relieved from this unseemly distress, but by means which have hazarded the affection of the people, and shaken the confidence of parliament.* If the public treasures had been exhausted in magnificence and splendour, this distress would have been accounted for, and in some measure justified. Nothing would be more unworthy of this nation, than, with a mean and mechanical rule, to mete out the splendour of the crown. Indeed I have found very few persons disposed to so ungenerous a procedure ; but the

generality of people, it must be confessed, do feel a good deal mortified, when they compare the wants of the court with its expenses. They do not behold the cause of this distress in any part of the apparatus of royal magnificence. In all this they see nothing, *but the operations of parsimony attended with all the consequences of profusion.*" (Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents.)

The opinions of Junius on the civil list debt, concur in general with those maintained by Mr. Burke. In one of his private letters to Mr. Wilkes (Sept. 7, 1771), I find these words: "The manner in which the late debt upon the civil list was pretended to be incurred, and really paid, demands a particular examination. *Never was there a more impudent outrage offered to a free people.*" The following passage on the same subject occurs in his first public letter signed Junius: "As to the debt upon the civil list, the people of England expect, that it will not be paid without a strict inquiry how it was incurred. If it must be paid by parliament, let me advise the Chancellor of the Exchequer to think of some better expedient than a lottery. To support an expensive war, or in circumstances of absolute necessity, a lottery may perhaps be allowable; but,

besides that it is at all times the very worst way of raising money upon the people, I think it ill-becomes the royal dignity to have the debts of a king provided for, like the repairs of a country bridge, or a decayed hospital." In another of his letters (June 12, 1769) we find the following passage: "Has not Sir John Moore a pension of £500. a year? This may probably be an acquittance of favours upon the turf; but is it possible for a minister to offer a grosser outrage to a nation, which has so very lately *cleared away the beggary of the civil list*, at the expense of more than half a million?" In his Preface he thus addresses the King, "With the greatest unappropriated revenue of any prince in Europe, *have we not seen you reduced to such vile and sordid distresses, as would have conducted any other man to a prison?*" And again—"A prince (whose piety and self-denial, one would think, might secure him from such a multitude of worldly necessities), with an annual revenue of near a million sterling, *unfortunately wants money*. The navy of England, by an equally strange concurrence of unforeseen circumstances, (though not quite so unfortunately for his Majesty) is in equal want of timber." "It happened, however, very luckily for the privy purse, that one of the above wants promised fair to supply the other. Our

religious, benevolent, generous Sovereign has no objection to selling *his own timber*, to *his own* admiralty, to repair *his own* ships, nor to putting the money into *his own* pocket." (Junius, vol. ii. p. 325-6.) With all candid scholars, the present, as well as those specimens of a coincidence in opinion between both these writers, which I have already mentioned, will have due weight. What influence they are likely to have with those critics, who think, that Burke could not write like Junius, I know not, nor is it worth my while to conjecture; for obstinacy is not likely to be easily convinced. But we know, that some would not be convinced, even though one should arise from the dead.

The following passage occurs in one of his letters in reply to Mr. Horne: "He (Mr. Horne) talks to us, in high terms, of the gallant feats he would have performed, if he had lived in the last century. *The unhappy Charles could hardly have escaped them. But living princes have a claim to his attachment and respect. Upon these terms there is no danger in being a patriot.*" \*\*\*  
 "Grievances like these were the foundation of the rebellion in the last century, and, if I understand Mr. Horne, they would, at that period, have justified him to his own mind, in deliberately



attacking the life of his Sovereign." \*\*\* "If propositions like these cannot be fairly maintained, I do not see how he can reconcile it to his conscience, not to act immediately with the same freedom, with which he speaks." Some of my readers, I am persuaded, will not be unwilling to agree with me in thinking, that the above extract is written precisely in the same spirit with the following passage from Burke's *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*: "*Few are the partizans of departed tyranny; and to be a Whig, on the business of an hundred years ago, is very consistent with every advantage of present servility. This retrospective wisdom and historical patriotism are things of wonderful convenience; and serve admirably to reconcile the old quarrel between speculation and practice. Many a stern republican, after gorging himself with a full feast of admiration of the Grecian commonwealths and of our true Saxon constitution, and discharging all the splendid bile of his virtuous indignation on King John, and King James, sits down perfectly satisfied to the coarsest work and homeliest job of the day he lives in.*"

In a subsequent part of the same tract, Mr. Burke, speaking of the undue influence of the Crown on the House of Commons, says, "It must

always be the wish of an unconstitutional statesman, that an House of Commons, who are entirely dependant upon him, should have every right of the people entirely dependent on their pleasure. *It was soon discovered, that the forms of a free, and the ends of an arbitrary government, were things not altogether incompatible.*" And again, "With such a degree of acquiescence (on the part of parliament), any measure of any court might well be deemed thoroughly secure. The capital objects, and by much the most flattering characteristics of arbitrary power, would be obtained." "The power of discretionary disqualification by one law of parliament, and the necessity of paying every debt of the civil list by another law of parliament, if suffered to pass unnoticed, must establish such a fund of rewards and terrors, as will *make parliament the best appendage and support of arbitrary power, that ever was invented by the wit of man.*" Junius, in his Dedication, has a similar doctrine: "*This influence answers every purpose of arbitrary power to the crown, with an expense and oppression to the people, which would be unnecessary in an arbitrary government.* The best of our ministers find it the easiest and most compendious mode of conducting the King's affairs; and all ministers have a general interest in adhering to a sys-

tem, which, of itself, is sufficient to support them in office, without any assistance from personal virtue, popularity, labour, abilities or experience. It promises every gratification to avarice and ambition, and secures impunity."

If any scholar takes the trouble of comparing candidly and fully all that is said in various parts of the works of Burke and of Junius, on the undue influence of the crown, through the agency of a secret and irresponsible cabal, or court faction, I think he will be satisfied, that they were all written by the same author. The part of Mr. Burke's works, to which I particularly allude (for it is the fullest on the subject), is his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*. Some of the passages in Junius, which I would recommend for the subject of this comparison, will be found in the following parts, among others (pp. 9, 10, 11, 15, 17, 25, 52, 99, 100), of the third volume. (See also vol. i. pp. 12, 166.) The following words from another part of the third volume (p. 371) correspond fully with the opinions of Mr. Burke: "He (the King) abolished no distinctions but those which are essential to the safety of the constitution. King, lords, and commons, which should for ever stand clear of each other, were soon melted down into one common mass of power,

while equal care was taken to draw a line of separation between the legislature and the people, and more particularly between the representative and the constituent body of the commons." (See pp. 24-5, of this Inquiry.)

In an earlier part of his Dedication, Junius says, "If an honest, and, I may truly affirm, a laborious zeal for the public service has given me any weight in your esteem, *let me exhort and conjure you never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by, without a determined, persevering resistance. One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law.* What yesterday was fact, to-day is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and where they do not suit exactly, the defect is supplied by analogy." Burke, in the same spirit says, that "any new powers exercised in the House of Lords, or in the House of Commons, or by the Crown, ought certainly to excite the vigilant and anxious jealousy of a free people. Even a new and unprecedented course of action in the whole legislature, without great and evident reason, may be a subject of just uneasiness."

On the subject of the remonstrance, made at Paris by Lord Rochford, on the intended invasion of Corsica by the French, Junius says, "If, instead of disowning Lord Shelburne, the British court had interposed with dignity and firmness, you know, my Lord, that Corsica would never have been invaded. *The French saw the weakness of a distracted ministry, and were justified in treating you with contempt.* They would probably have yielded in the first instance, rather than hazard a rupture with this country; but, being once engaged, they cannot retreat without dishonour." Mr. Burke agrees exactly with Junius on this topic; but, as the passage is too long, I shall extract only a part of it, referring the reader for the whole to the *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*. "If, by any chance, the ministers, who stand before the curtain, possess or affect any spirit, it makes little or no impression. Foreign courts and ministers, who were among the first to discover and to profit by this invention of the *Double Cabinet*, attend very little to their remonstrances." \* \* \* "If one of those ministers officially takes up a business with spirit, it serves only the better to signalize the meanness of the rest, and the discord of them all. His colleagues in office are in haste to shake him off,

and to disclaim the whole of his proceedings. Of this nature was that astonishing transaction, in which Lord Rochford, our ambassador at Paris, remonstrated against the attempt upon Corsica, in consequence of a direct authority from Lord Shelburne. This remonstrance the French minister treated with the contempt that was natural; as he was assured, from the ambassador of his court to ours, that these orders of Lord Shelburne were not supported by the rest of the administration. Lord Rochford, a man of spirit, could not endure this situation\*.” \*\*\* “By this transaction the condition of our court lay exposed in all its nakedness. Our office correspondence has lost all pretence to authenticity; British policy is brought into derision in those nations, that awhile ago trembled at the power of our arms, whilst they looked up with confidence to the equity, firmness and candour, which shone in all our negociations.”

Junius maintains the right of the people to interfere directly, whenever they find their interest abandoned by their representatives: “Whe-

\* As a coincidence of opinion, it deserves to be remarked here, that Junius speaks, with respect, of the abilities and official experience of Lord Rochford. (See vol. i. p. 57; and Miscellaneous Letters, No. 49, vol. iii. pp. 177, 8, 9, and 186.



ther the remonstrance be, or be not injurious to parliament, is the very question between parliament and the people; and such a question as cannot be decided by the assertion of a third party, however respectable. That the petitioning for the dissolution of parliament is irreconcilable with the principles of the constitution, is a new doctrine. His Majesty, perhaps, has not been informed, that the House of Commons themselves have, by a formal resolution, admitted it to be the right of the subject.” “The City of London has not desired the King to assume a power placed in other hands. \* \* \* They solicit their Sovereign to exert that constitutional authority, which the laws have vested in him, for the benefit of his subjects. They call upon him to make use of his lawful prerogative, in a case, which our laws evidently supposed might happen, since they have provided for it by trusting the sovereign with a discretionary power to dissolve the parliament. This request, I am confident, will be supported by remonstrances from all parts of the kingdom.” \* \* \* “The City of London have given an example, which, I doubt not, will be followed by the whole kingdom. The noble spirit of the metropolis is the life-blood of the state, collected at the heart: from that point it circulates, with health and vigour, through

every artery of the constitution. *The time is come, when the body of the English people must assert their own cause: conscious of their strength, and animated by a sense of their duty, they will not surrender their birth-right to ministers, to parliaments, or kings.*" (See vol. ii. letter 37.)

Such also is the doctrine of Mr. Burke: "I see no other way for the preservation of a decent attention to public interest in the representatives, but *the interposition of the body of the people itself*, whenever it shall appear, by some flagrant and notorious act, by some capital innovation, that these representatives are going to overleap the fences of the law, and to introduce an arbitrary power. This interposition is a most unpleasant remedy. But, if it is a legal remedy, it is intended on some occasion to be used; to be used then only, when it is evident, that nothing else can hold the constitution to its true principles."

"It is not in Parliament alone that the remedy for parliamentary disorders can be completed: hardly, indeed, can it begin there. Until a confidence in government is established, *the people ought to be excited to a more strict and detailed attention to the conduct of their representatives.*" (Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents.) The following remarks on the same subject may be seen in the address of Junius to the King: "The

English nation declare they are grossly injured by their representatives, and solicit your Majesty to exert your lawful prerogative, and give them an opportunity of recalling a trust, which they find has been scandalously abused. You are not to be told, that the power of the House of Commons is not original, but delegated to them for the welfare of the people, from whom they received it. A question of right arises between the constituent and the representative body. By what authority shall it be decided? Will your Majesty interfere in a question, in which you have properly no immediate concern? It would be a step equally odious and unnecessary. Shall the Lords be called upon to determine the rights and privileges of the Commons? They cannot do it without a flagrant breach of the constitution. Or will you refer it to the Judges? They have often told your ancestors, that the law of parliament is above them. What party then remains, *but to leave it to the people to determine for themselves? They alone are injured; and, since there is no superior power, to which the cause can be referred, they alone ought to determine.*"

Junius, in the same letter, addresses the King in these words, "*The fortune, which made you a king, forbid you to have a friend. It is a law of*

*nature, which cannot be violated with impunity. The mistaken prince, who looks for friendship, will find a favourite, and in that favourite the ruin of his affairs."* Mr. Burke, alluding to the effects of court-favouritism, the very same year, and to the mortifying condescensions and humiliations, to which the King was exposed by that system, says—"Indeed, it is a law of nature, that whoever is necessary to what we have made our object, is sure in some way, or in some time or other, to become our master."

Alluding to the proceedings of the House of Commons, in the case of the Middlesex election, Junius says to the King, "I do not mean to perplex you with a tedious argument *upon a subject already so discussed, that inspiration could hardly throw a new light upon it.*" On the same subject Mr. Burke has the following remarks: "The arguments, upon which this claim was founded and combated, are not my business here. *Never has a subject been more amply and more learnedly handled; nor, upon one side, in my opinion, more satisfactorily. They, who are not convinced by what is already written, would not receive conviction, though one arose from the dead. I too have thought on this subject: but my purpose here is only to consider it as a part of the project of*

government; to observe on the motives which led to it; and to trace its political consequences."

Mr. Burke, in his speech on American taxation, says, "These excellent and trusty servants of the King, justly fearful lest they themselves should have lost all credit with the world, *bring out the image of their gracious Sovereign from the inmost and most sacred shrine, and they pawn him as a security for their promises.*" And immediately afterwards, after quoting part of Lord Botetourt's speech to the Assembly of Virginia, adds the following words: "A glorious and true character! which (since we suffer his ministers with impunity to answer for his ideas of taxation) we ought to make it our business to enable his Majesty to preserve in all its lustre. Let him have character, since ours is no more! Let some part of government be kept in respect." The character, to which he alludes, is that given of the King in the following part of Lord Botetourt's speech. "That satisfaction which I have been authorised to promise this day, by the confidential servants of our gracious Sovereign, who, to my certain knowledge, *rates his honour so high, that he would rather part with his crown, than preserve it by deceit.*" There are many parts of Junius written in the very same spirit; and we

know, that he frequently attacked the ministry, for bringing forward the King too often, with a view of sheltering themselves beneath his character. The reader will find proofs enough of this in his letters of the 19th of March and 3d of April, 1770. "I would separate, as much as possible, the King's personal character and behaviour from the acts of the present government." And, alluding to the harsh answer given by the King to the remonstrance of the City of London—"This distinction, however, is only true with respect to the measure itself. The consequences of it reach beyond the minister, and materially affect his Majesty's honour." "It has not been usual in this country, at least since the days of Charles the First, to see the Sovereign personally at variance, or engaged in a direct altercation with his subjects. Acts of grace and indulgence are wisely appropriated to him, and should constantly be performed by himself. He never should appear but in an amiable light to his subjects." "Measures of greater severity may, indeed, in some circumstances be necessary; but the minister, who advises, should take the execution and odium of them entirely upon himself. He not only betrays his master, but violates the spirit of the English constitution, when he exposes the chief magistrate to the personal hatred, or con-



tempt of his subjects." "The reputation of public measures depends upon the minister, who is responsible, not upon the King, whose private opinions are not supposed to have any weight against the advice of his council, *whose personal authority should, therefore, never be interposed in public affairs.*" The remainder of the paragraph deserves to be read, but it is too long for transcription. The following is also in the same spirit: "I do not mean to express the smallest anxiety for the minister's reputation. He acts separately for himself, and the most shameful inconsistency may perhaps be no disgrace to him. *But when the Sovereign, who represents the majesty of the state, appears in person, his dignity should be supported.* The occasion should be important; the plan well considered; the execution steady and consistent. My zeal for his Majesty's real honour compels me to assert, *that it has been too much the system of the present reign to introduce him personally, either to act for, or to defend his servants. They persuade him to do what is properly their business, and desert him in the midst of it.* Yet this is an inconvenience, to which he must for ever be exposed, while he adheres to a ministry *divided among themselves, or unequal in credit and ability to the great task they have undertaken. Instead of reserving the*

*interposition of the royal personage, as the last resource of government, their weakness obliges them to apply it to every ordinary occasion, and to render it cheap and common in the opinion of the people. Instead of supporting their master, they look to him for support; and, for the emolument of remaining one day more in office, care not how much his sacred character is prostituted and dishonoured."*

If the reader will compare a part of the last private letter from Junius to Mr. Woodfall, with some remarks made by Mr. Burke, towards the conclusion of his letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol (vol. iii. p. 202), I think he will be able to trace a similarity of thinking in both. For the sake of brevity I decline quoting either. The reader may also find, in an earlier part of this Inquiry, extracts from both of a similar tendency.

Those, who have read the new edition in particular, must remember, how often and how severely Lords Camden and Chatham were attacked by Junius for maintaining, that there were occasions in which the crown had a right, and was vested with a power, to dispense with the laws. In this opinion he agrees with Mr. Burke, who says in his speech at Bristol, in 1780, "For

very obvious reasons *you cannot trust the crown with a dispensing power over any of your laws.*"

The spirit of the following remarks, taken from the *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*, is very like some parts of one of the letters of Junius to Mr. Wilkes. "The next favourite remedy (says Mr. Burke) is a place-bill. The same principle guides in both; I mean the opinion, which is entertained by many of the infallibility of laws and regulations in the cure of public distempers. Without being as unreasonably doubtful, as many are unwisely confident, I will only say, that this also is a matter very well worthy of serious and mature reflection." \*\*\*  
 "It is no inconsiderable part of wisdom to know, how much of an evil ought to be tolerated; lest, by attempting a degree of purity impracticable in degenerate times and manners, instead of cutting off the subsisting ill-practices, new corruptions might be produced for the concealment and security of the old." "A restoration of the right of free election is a preliminary indispensable to every other reformation. What alterations ought afterwards to be made in the constitution, is a matter of deep and difficult research." The reader may easily find many passages of a similar nature in Mr. Burke's works. The following ex-

tract from his speech on American conciliation, is in the same spirit : “ Although there are some amongst us who think our constitution wants many improvements, to make it a complete system of liberty, perhaps none, who are of that opinion, would think it right to aim at such improvement, by disturbing his country, and risking every thing that is dear to him. In every arduous enterprise, we consider what we are to lose, as well as what we are to gain ; and the more and better stake of liberty every people possess, the less they will hazard in a vain attempt to make it more. These are the cords of man. Man acts from adequate motives relative to his interest ; and not on metaphysical speculations. Aristotle, the great master of reasoning, cautions us, and with great weight and propriety, against this species of delusive geometrical accuracy in moral arguments, as the most fallacious of all sophistry.” If we compare these passages and that part of the *Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontents*, from which the former of them are taken, with a letter of Junius to Mr. Wilkes, of the 7th of September, 1771, it will not, I think, be difficult to find some similarity between both. The following extracts are from parts of that letter : of a place-bill, Junius says, “ Can any man in his senses affirm, that, as things are

now constituted in this country, it is possible to *exterminate corruption?* Do you seriously think it possible to carry through both houses such a place-bill as you describe in the fifth article? When you talk of contracts and lottery tickets, do you think that any human law can really prevent their being distributed and accepted?" "That the people are not equally and fully represented is unquestionable *But let us take care what we attempt: we may demolish the venerable fabric we intend to repair; and where is the strength and the virtue to erect a better in its stead?*" "As to cutting away the rotten boroughs, &c, I own I have both doubts and apprehensions, in regard to the remedy you propose. I shall be charged, perhaps, with an unusual want of political intrepidity, when I honestly confess to you, that I am startled at the idea of so extensive an amputation." "When all your instruments of amputation are prepared; when the unhappy patient lies bound at your feet, without the possibility of resistance, *by what infallible rule will you direct the operation?* When you propose to cut away the rotten parts, can you tell us what parts are perfectly sound? Are there any certain limits, in fact or theory, to inform you, at what point you must stop,—at what point the mortification ends? To a man, so capable



of observation and reflection as you are, it is unnecessary to say all that might be said upon the subject." These are not the only instances, in which Burke and Junius declare themselves hostile to the views of those, who expressed a wish to innovate upon the constitution, with a view to its improvement or reformation. In a subsequent letter (September the 18th, 1771) to Mr. Wilkes, and in answer to some remarks by him on annual parliaments, Junius says, "*The question is not what is best in theory, but what is most expedient in practice. You labour to carry the constitution to a point of perfection which it can never reach to, or at which it cannot long be stationary. In this idea I think I see the mistake of a speculative man, who is either not conversant with the world, or not sufficiently persuaded of the necessity of taking things as they are.*" Every body in the least acquainted with Mr. Burke's writings, must remember how frequently he condemns theory and speculation in politics, and that he uniformly declares himself for practice and experience, as the only safe guides in legislation and jurisprudence\*.

\* The reader may compare these extracts with a passage in Burke's speech on conciliation with America. He will find it at page 35 of the third volume of his works. Let him also consult pages 176, 7. Opinions partly of a similar tendency will be found, in his speech on American taxation, at pages 86 and 89; and still earlier, in his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*: from which it will appear,



The following remarks will be found in the second volume of the new edition of Junius: (pp. 136, 7) "The prorogation of parliament naturally calls upon us to review their proceedings, and to consider the condition in which they have left the kingdom. I do not question but they have done what is usually called the King's business, much to his Majesty's satisfaction. We have only to lament, that, in consequence of a system introduced, or revived in the present reign, this kind of merit should be very consistent with the neglect of every duty they owe to the nation. The interval between the opening of the last and the close of the former session was longer than usual. Whatever were the views of the minister, in deferring the meeting of parliament, *sufficient time was certainly given to every member of the House of Commons, to look back upon the steps he had taken, and the consequences they had produced.*

that, nearly from the commencement of his political career, he was an enemy to speculative and metaphysical innovations in politics, and to the refinements of those who would alter the constitution, from the mere suggestions of theory, regardless of experience. "*To innovate,*" says he, on one occasion speaking of the affairs of America, "*is not to reform.*" The Americans have been very serviceable to Britain under the old system; do not let us, therefore, rashly seek a new. Our commercial interests have been hitherto very greatly promoted by our friendly intercourse with the colonies; do not let us endanger possession for contingency; do not let us substitute untried theories for a system experimentally ascertained to be useful."

*The zeal of party, the violence of personal animosities, and the heat of contention, had leisure to subside. From that period, whatever resolution they took was deliberate and prepense."* Mr. Burke often touches upon the utility of prorogations of parliament, in order that the members might have an opportunity of seeing the practical effects of their measures on the nation at large. One extract will be sufficient to show his agreement with Junius on this point. That, which I select, is the conclusion of his letter to a member of the National Assembly, in 1791. "In England we *cannot* work so hard as Frenchmen. Frequent relaxation is necessary to us. You are naturally more intense in your application. I did not know this part of your national character until I went into France in 1773. At present, this your disposition to labour is rather increased than lessened. In your assembly you do not allow yourselves a recess even on Sundays. We have two days in the week, besides the festivals; and besides five or six months of the summer and autumn. This continued, unremitted effort of the members of your assembly, I take to be one among the causes of the mischief they have done. They, who always labour, can have no true judgment. *You never give yourselves time to cool. You can never survey, from its proper point of sight, the work you have finished, before you decree*

*its final execution. You can never plan the future by the past. You never go into the country, soberly and dispassionately, to observe the effect of your measures on their objects. You cannot feel distinctly how far the people are rendered better and improved, or more miserable and depraved, by what you have done. You cannot see, with your own eyes, the sufferings and afflictions you cause. You know them but at a distance, on the statements of those who always flatter the reigning power, and who, amidst their representations of the grievances, inflame your minds against those who are oppressed. These are amongst the effects of unremitted labour, when men exhaust their attention, burn out their candles, and are left in the dark. *Malo meorum negligentiam quam istorum obscuram diligentiam.*"*

Junius and Burke having, I think, with two or three exceptions, agreed, almost wholly, upon every important political question of their day, it would be easy for me to multiply these examples of their coincidence of opinion, as instances may be selected from most parts of their works. As most of my readers, however, may be disposed to think, that I have dwelt on it too long, it is not my intention to call their attention much longer to this part of the subject. Before dismissing it, however, I may allude to their

strictures on the Board of Trade, which was attacked with much severity and ridicule by both, as the reader will be able to see, by looking into Mr. Burke's speech upon economical reform, and into three of the Miscellaneous Letters of Junius. (See vol. iii. nos. 26, 27, 28.)

The last instance of their agreement in opinion, which it is now my intention to notice, relates to the official correspondence of Lord Hillsborough, which they treat with very little respect. "The choice (says Junius) at least announced to us a man of superior capacity and knowledge. Whether he be so, or not, let his dispatches, as far as they have appeared, let his measures, as far as they have operated, determine for him. In the former we have seen strong assertions without proof, declamation without argument, and violent censures without dignity or moderation; but neither correctness in the composition, nor judgment in the design." (Vol. i. p. 556.) "As a man of abilities for public business your first experiment has been unfortunate. Your circular letter to the American governors, both for matter and composition, is a performance, which a schoolboy ought to blush for." And after some extracts from his Lordship's Letter: "What are these but the

loose hackneyed terms of office, which make no impression because they convey no argument, and hardly a determinate meaning." "Is this the language of business, or attention? Your letter, my Lord, does, indeed, deserve contempt, but the enterprises of the colonies are of other importance." (Vol. iii. pp. 148, 9, 50.) "In his new department, I am sorry to say, he has shewn neither abilities, nor good sense. His letters to the colonies contain nothing but expressions equally loose and violent." "His correspondence, upon the whole, is so defective both in design and composition, that it would deserve our pity, if the consequences to be dreaded from it did not excite our indignation." (Ibid. p. 172.) Mr. Burke, in his speech on American taxation, treats Lord Hillsborough's dispatches with as little ceremony and respect. "It has been said again and again, that the five taxes were repealed on commercial principles. It is so said in the paper in my hand\*: a paper which I constantly carry about; which I have often used, and shall often use again." "This speech (from the throne) was made on the 9th day of May, 1769. Five days after this

\* Lord Hillsborough's Circular Letter to the governors of the Colonies, concerning the repeal of some of the duties laid in the Act of Parliament of 1767.

speech, that is on the 13th of the same month, the public circular letter, a part of which I am going to read to you, was written by Lord Hillsborough, Secretary of State for the Colonies." After making some extracts from Lord Hillsborough's letter, he adds these words :—" Here, Sir, *is a canonical book of ministerial scripture ; the general Epistle to the Americans*"—expressions, which sufficiently shew, that Mr. Burke was as well disposed as Junius, though he could not do it with so much propriety in his place in parliament, to treat the official correspondence of Lord Hillsborough with ridicule and contempt.

In order to prevent this Inquiry from extending to an immoderate length I find it necessary to conclude this discussion concerning similarity of style, with the following extracts from Mr. Burke's *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*. " His Majesty came to the throne of these kingdoms, with more advantages than any of his predecessors since the revolution. Fourth in descent, and third in succession of his Royal family, even the zealots of hereditary right, in him saw something to flatter their favourite prejudices ; and to justify a transfer of their attachments, without a change in their



principles \*. The person and cause of the tender were become contemptible: his title disowned throughout Europe, his party disbanded in England. His Majesty came, indeed, to the inheritance of a mighty war; but, victorious in every part of the globe, peace was always in his power, not to negotiate, but to dictate. No foreign habitudes or attachments withdrew him from the cultivation of his power at home. His revenue for the civil establishment, fixed (as it was then thought) at a large but definite sum, was ample without being invidious. His influence, by additions from conquests, by an augmentation of debt, by an increase of military and naval establishment, much strengthened and extended. And coming to the throne in the prime and full vigour of youth, as from affection there was a strong dislike, so from dread there seemed to be a general averseness from giving anything like offence to a monarch, against whose resentment opposition could not look for a refuge in any sort of reversionary hope." In another part of the same tract he writes thus:—An exterior administration, chosen for its impotency, or, after it is chosen, purposely rendered impotent,

\* If the reader will look into the first paragraphs of the address of Junius to the king, he will find part of them written in exactly the same spirit. (See vol. ii. pp. 66, 7, 8, 77, 8, 9.)

in order to be rendered subservient, will not be obeyed. The laws themselves will not be respected, when those, who execute them, are despised ; and they will be despised, when their power is not immediate from the crown, or natural in the kingdom. Never were ministers better supported in parliament. Parliamentary support comes and goes with office, totally regardless of the man, or the merit. Is government strengthened ? it grows weaker and weaker ; the popular torrent gains upon it every hour. Let us learn from our experience. It is not support that is wanting to government, but reformation. When ministry rests upon public opinion, it is not, indeed, built upon a rock of adamant ; but when it stands upon private humour, its structure is of stubble, and its foundation is on quicksand. I repeat it again, *He, that supports every administration, subverts all government.*" The following beautiful passage possesses, in a high degree, all the peculiarities, by which the style and manner of Junius are distinguished. "The court party resolve the whole into faction." \*\* "When they give this account of the prevalence of faction, they present no very favourable aspect of the confidence of the people in their own government. \*\*\* When the people conceive, that laws and tribunals, and even

popular assemblies, are perverted from the ends of their institution, they find in those names of degenerated establishments only new motives to discontent. Those bodies, which, when full of life and beauty, lay in their arms, and were their joy and comfort, when dead and putrid, become but the more loathsome, from remembrance of former endearments. A sullen gloom and furious disorder prevail, by fits; the nation loses its relish for peace and prosperity, as it did in that season of fullness, which opened our troubles in the time of Charles I. A species of men, to whom a state of order would become a sentence of obscurity, are nourished into a dangerous magnitude, by the heat of intestine disturbances; and it is no wonder, that, by a sort of sinister piety, they cherish, in their turn, the disorders, which are the parents of all their consequence. Superficial observers consider such persons as the cause of the public uneasiness, when, in truth, they are nothing more than the effect of it. Good men look upon this distracted scene with sorrow and indignation. Their hands are tied behind them. They are despoiled of all the power, which might enable them to reconcile the strength of government with the rights of the people. They stand in a most distressing alternative. But, in the election among evils,

they hope better things from temporary confusion than from established servitude. In the mean time, the voice of law is not to be heard. Fierce licentiousness begets violent restraints. The military arm is the sole reliance ; and then, call your constitution what you please, it is the sword that governs. The civil power, like every other that calls in the aid of an ally stronger than itself, perishes by the assistance it receives. But the contrivers of this scheme of government will not trust solely to the military power ; because they are cunning men. Their restless and crooked spirit drives them to rake in the dirt of every kind of expedient. Unable to rule the multitude, they endeavour to raise divisions amongst them. One mob is hired to destroy another ; a procedure, which at once encourages the boldness of the populace, and justly increases their discontent. Men become pensioners of state on account of their abilities in the array of riot and the discipline of confusion. Government is put under the disgraceful necessity of protecting from the severity of the laws, that very licentiousness, which the laws had been before violated to repress. Every thing partakes of the original disorder. Anarchy predominates without freedom, and servitude without submission, or subordination. These are the conse-

quences inevitable to our public peace, from the scheme of rendering the executory government at once odious and feeble; of freeing administration from the constitutional and salutary controul of parliament, and inventing for it *a new controul*, unknown to the constitution, *an interior cabinet*; which brings the whole body of government into confusion and contempt.”

Although, from the numerous examples already produced, to shew such an identity of thinking and similarity of style, as could not be merely accidental in any two writers, some may suppose, that I have already done enough on this part of the subject, it is still my intention to give other kinds of proof relative to style, and such proofs, indeed, as I am persuaded it will never be in the power of criticism to beat down by the powerful batteries of fair argument, aided by all the skirmishings of sophistry, chicanery, and evasion. The specimens, which I mean to give, are not proofs of excellency, but the contrary: they are specimens of faults against grammar, of bad construction, of vicious arrangement, and of bad taste, according to the received and established rules for correct and elegant writing. They are the leading, and almost the only defects, which occur in the writings both of Burke

and of Junius; and, to prove that they were not the effect of design, it will be sufficient to say, that they run through the works of both, from one end to the other. The first class of specimens, which I mean to give, come under the head of *inverted construction*. Besides the circumstance of its being far less elegant and obvious than the direct and natural arrangement, this species of construction has this additional disadvantage attending it, that its obvious and necessary tendency is to throw words of little weight, or meaning, into the end of phrases or sentences, where such words only, as are important from their sound, or meaning, ought to be placed.

The following examples of this species of construction are taken from Junius. My object in making such a numerous selection is to shew, that he was not aware of its being a defect, but that it was with him a steady and settled habit of writing. In a private letter to Mr. Woodfall this passage occurs. "That Swinney is a wretched, but a dangerous fool. He had the impudence to go to Lord George Sackville, *whom he had never spoken to*, and to ask him, whether, or no, he was the author of Junius? Take care of him." It is more elegant by far, and more natural to



say—"to whom he had never spoken"—than to use the arrangement adopted by the author. This inverted construction may be allowable in conversation, or in private letters, but in public speaking, and in all other kinds of composition, it is a defect, not an ornament. The following examples are also taken from his private letters. "A man who can neither write common English, nor spell, is hardly worth attending to." "You have never flinched, that I know of." "I shall be glad to see the packet you speak of." "Their inserting the whole proves they had no strong passages to fix on." "Which you never can depart from." "Admitting the apparent advantage to the cause you are engaged in." "Are these the terms, which men who are in earnest make use of." "As to particular grievances, all those we complain of." "There cannot be a doctrine more fatal to the liberty and property we are contending for." "Yet to be excluded from those honours, which are the only rewards he pretends to." "A point of perfection which it can never reach to." "The domestic society *you speak of* is much to be envied." "Feeling for others, when my own safety is provided for." "Ask that amiable daughter, whom you so implicitly confide in." So far from the private letters. That the same construction runs through

all his public letters will be evident from the following examples. "In the present instance they really create to their own minds, or greatly exaggerate *the evil they complain of.*" (Vol. i. p. 11.) Surely, at the end of such a sentence, it would be better to say, "*the evil of which they complain,*" or "*the evil which is the cause of their complaint.*" "Our ministers and magistrates have little punishment to fear, and few difficulties to contend with." (P. 13.) "In the late prosecutions of the printers of my address to a great personage, the juries were never fairly dealt with." (P. 14.) "If the true spirit of those articles were religiously adhered to." (P. 40.) "No plan has been formed, no system adhered to." "If his plan be not irrevocably fixed on." (P. 52.) "Which, considering the temper they were in, it was impossible they should comply with." (P. 56.) "That writers, such as I am, are the real cause of all the public evils we complain of." (P. 71.) "And truly, the part, you have undertaken, is at least as much as you are equal to." (P. 73.) "If there be not a fatality attending every measure you are concerned in." (P. 109.) "To give the sanction of government to the riots you complain of." (P. 113.) "Avail yourself of all the unforgiving piety of the court you live in." (P. 121.) "Your age demands

some respect, or the cause, you have embarked in, would entitle you to none." (P. 122.) "Which common candour should have forbidden you to make use of." (P. 136.) "Return, my Lord, before it is too late, to that easy insipid system, which you first set out with." (P. 138.) "Let us look back together to a scene, in which a mind like yours will find nothing to repent of." (P. 140.) "Lord Chatham formed his last administration upon principles, which you certainly concurred in, or, &c." (P. 144.) "An acquisition, the importance of which you have probably no conception of." (P. 150.) "The coy resistance you constantly met with in the British senate." (P. 151.) "That venal vote, which you have already paid for." (P. 170.) "Or the custom of parliament must be referred to." (P. 175.) "The specific disability, which we speak of." (P. 176.) "A decision of the house, diametrically opposite to that, which the present House of Commons came to in favour of Mr. Luttrell." (P. 187.) "There is no statute, by which the disability we speak of is created." (P. 214.) "But Junius has a great authority to support him, *which*, to speak with the Duke of Grafton, *I accidentally met with* this morning, in the course of my reading." (P. 218.) Thus far from the first volume. The instances of the

same kind of construction, which occur in the second volume, are still more numerous. But as the examples I have already given are sufficient for my purpose, I shall content myself with referring the reader to the work itself, should he think further examples necessary. Some of the pages of the second volume where they occur are mentioned in the note \*.

Had I no other reasons for thinking, that the letters of Junius were written by Mr. Burke, the inference arising from this species of construction would be wholly satisfactory to my mind. Junius cannot be supposed to have adopted it as an improvement, for it is, in the opinion of all good judges, a defect in composition. The truth is, that he was not aware of its being a fault, or sensible that such an inelegant peculiarity ran through all his writings. The following detail will shew, that Mr. Burke was as partial to it as Junius, though it is not possible to suppose,

\* Of the 2d volume, see pp. 7, 30, 39, 55, 60, 62, 74, 75, 78, 80, 88, 90, 94, 99, 100, 102, 118, 135, 142, 166, 167, 177, 179, 186, 209, 211, 214, 215, 220, 226, 238, 255, 257, 265, 304, 306, 313, 317, 322, 323, 327, 343, 346, 350, 351, 358, 380, 386, 406, 407, 409, 413, 434, 437. All these examples occur in the letters, signed Junius and Philo-Junius. They are equally numerous in his Miscellaneous Letters, forming a part of the 2d, and the whole of the 3d volume. But it is unnecessary to cite further.

that he could think it ornamental; nor, admitting him to be Junius, can it be at all credited, that he adopted it under that signature for the purpose of disguising his style, since it is equally common in all his acknowledged writings. Whether Burke and Junius were the same person, or not, it is clear beyond all doubt, from their frequent use of it, that neither was aware, that he was trespassing against the rules of elegant composition and good taste in adopting this inverted construction, or arrangement. The following specimens are taken from his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*. “To complain of the age we live in.” “The day he lives in.” “Until the period we are speaking of.” “The controversy is about that degree of good humour in the people, which may possibly be attained, and ought certainly to be looked for.” “Beyond any that I have heard or read of.” “Here it was spoken of,” &c. “His distress would have been accounted for.” “All this, however, is submitted to.” “The evil complained of.” “This is not a thing to be trifled with.” “A degree of servitude that no worthy man could bear the thought of submitting to.” “They will be cast into that miserable alternative, which no good man can look upon, without horror.” I find the following examples in

his speech at Bristol, in September, 1780, that is, more than ten years after the publication of his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*. "My pretensions are such as you cannot be ashamed of." "Those parts of it which have been most excepted to." "Promises were made and engagements entered into." "Nothing remains now to trouble you with." "It was a ghost, which all had heard of." "The proceedings which have been complained of." "The affairs of religion which are no longer heard of." "The party I speak of." "The act that is complained of." "This voice ought to be listened to." "Whose names you never heard of." "This unanimous concurrence of whatever the nation has to boast of." "At the crisis I speak of." "What is done in England is still looked to." "Which infected and poisoned the air we breathed in." "This lust of party power is the liberty they thirst and hunger for." "Some of this description, and persons of worth I have met with." "That their opinions ought to have been previously taken and attended to." If the reader wishes for further specimens, let him look to the note \*.

\* Although we find this species of inversion in all parts of Mr. Burke's Works, it occurs more frequently in his early, than in his later writings. Those who will take the trouble of looking into the early volumes of the *Annual Register* will meet it frequently there. It is, indeed, so marked a peculiarity in his style, that one may use it as a pretty sure cri-



Anxious as the critics must have been to discover any clue to the secret of Junius, it is not a little singular, that this very striking peculiarity in his writings, and in those of Mr. Burke, should have hitherto escaped their observation. It is still more singular, that, in reading the works of both, it never struck them, that they coincided, not only in this respect, but also in regard to every other leading defect, or inelegance of construction, by which the writings of either are distinguished. At least so convinced am I of the truth of this remark, that I shall pledge myself, if any body produces from the works of either several specimens of any marked

terion for discovering his anonymous compositions. The 3d volume of his Works, in 8vo. (Rivington's edition of 1801), contains *two of his speeches at Bristol*, his *speech on American conciliation*, his *letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol*, *two letters to gentlemen in Bristol*, and his *speech on economical reform*. If the reader will look into this volume, he will find further specimens of inverted construction in the parts referred to as follows:—P. 19, 20, 46, 49, 136, 140, 197, 213, 221, 222, 227, 231, 242, 255, 270, 273, 274, 281, 286, 291, 299, 332, 334, 335, 340, 345. In the *sixth volume* of his Works, which contains writings of a still later date, examples occur, among many others, in the following order:—P. 25, 45, 61, 62, 86, 90, 96, 121, 123, 136, 144, 162, 185, 204, 206, 219, 230, 243, 244, 250, 271-2, 280, 282, 304, 307, 315, 327, 331, 334, 335, 336, 337, 346, 362, 366, 370. It is not my intention, at present, to give any more specimens under this head: but, should the critics not be satisfied with those already produced, I shall undertake to furnish them with such a number as will make them tax me, not so much with a parsimony, as with too great a profusion of examples.

peculiarity, to point out examples of a similar kind in the writings of the other.

The next peculiarity, to which I shall direct the attention of my readers, is the improper use which both Junius and Mr. Burke frequently made of the article *an*. This article is correctly placed before words beginning with the letter *h*, if it be quiescent, as, for example, *an hour*; and before words beginning with a *u*, when it has its own proper sound, as in this example, *an umpire*. But the use of it is improper, if the *h* be not quiescent, as, *an head*, *an holy man*, *an hogshead*, *an hundred*, &c.; in all which cases the article *a* should be used, as the *h* has its own peculiar sound. The use of *an* before words beginning with a *u*, when that letter takes the sound of a *y*, is also inelegant and improper: thus in the following examples, *an union*, *an unit*, *an useless thing*, &c. In all such cases we should write *a union*, *a unit*, *a useless thing*, &c. Whatever volume of Mr. Burke's writings we may look into, we shall find him frequently trespassing against both these rules. The following instances are taken from the third volume of his works. "An hasty opinion." (P. 20.) "Was followed by an heightening of the distemper." (P. 27.) "Yields to an higher duty." (P. 30.)

"An healing and cementing principle." (P. 31.)  
 "An House of Commons." (P. 50.) "In an  
 high degree." (P. 57.) "An higher spirit."  
 (P. 54.) "An uniform experience." (P. 92.)  
 "There are few who will not prefer an useful  
 ally." (P. 170.) "An hundred times." (P. 182.)  
 "An habit of life." (P. 197.) "To strengthen  
 an union of such men." (P. 201.) "An union  
 with Ireland." (P. 215.) "An useless separa-  
 tion." (P. 269.) "An useful prejudice."  
 (P. 319.) Mr. Burke also frequently uses such  
 expressions as the following: "An whole system."  
 (P. 56.) "An whole people." (P. 69.) "An  
 whole nation." (P. 86.) If we look into his  
 sixth volume, we shall find, among others, the  
 following examples. "An whole nation." (P. 4.)  
 "For he chose an Hales for his Chief Justice."  
 (P. 15.) "He must have an heart of adamant."  
 (P. 47.) "An House of Lords." (P. 58.)  
 "An helping hand." (P. 61.) "An harsh yet  
 necessary duty." (P. 73.) "An whole commu-  
 nity." (P. 94.) "An hundred others." (P. 99.)  
 "For making an use." (P. 106.) "An habi-  
 tual delegation." (P. 209.) "An unanimous  
 agreement." (P. 212.) "An habitual regard."  
 (P. 218.) "That our constitution is an usur-  
 pation in its origin." (P. 240.) "An unanimity  
 and secresy." (P. 245.) "Has not been struck

out at an heat." (P. 261.) "With an Herculean robustness of mind." (P. 263.) "An universal exclusion." (P. 274.) "An higher situation." (P. 286.) "An happy state." (P. 312.) "They, (says he elsewhere) who can read the political sky, will see *an* hurricane in a cloud no bigger than *an* hand, at the very edge of the horizon, and will run into the first harbour."

If we read the works of Junius attentively we shall find many examples of the same peculiarities. For the sake of brevity I shall mention only a few. "Whenever Mr. Wilkes can tell me, that such *an union* is in prospect he shall hear from me." "If I were known I could no longer be *an useful* servant to the public." In his first letter he says "If, on the contrary, we see *an universal spirit* of distrust and dissatisfaction, &c." "When we speak of the firmness of government, we mean *an uniform system* of measures, &c." "Our countrymen derive from thence a firmness, *an uniformity*, and a perseverance in their designs, &c." "From thence arose that desperate proceeding, which has given such *an universal alarm* to property." "The surveyor general, who keeps all the crown titles, has *an hint* to find a weak part in some old possession." "Is it not *an heavy aggravation*, instead of the

least excuse for their offence?" "Every body perceived that one such instance, supporting itself on a general claim, was equivalent to, and (like *an universal proposition*) comprehended a thousand." "He assured us, that he did not know a single general officer (out of near *an hundred* now in the service) who was in any shape qualified to command the army." "He would be, ipso facto, *an universal orator*." "To support *an uniform system* of falsehood requires greater parts, than even those of Lord Mansfield." "An *humiliating* stipulation for referring the discussion of the prior right is a defeasance of the reparation." "It would be the duty of every honest man to question every act of such *an house of commons*." "Strange fluctuation: from fourteen and *an half* to twenty-two." "To whom he may formerly, perhaps, have given half-a-crown for negotiating *an hundred* pound stock." &c. &c.

Tedious, no doubt, as this species of evidence must appear to some of my readers, I cannot prevail on myself to dismiss it as yet, for I am satisfied, that it must have great weight with scholars; and these alone are the persons whose approbation I would wish to secure for this inquiry. They, I think, will readily forgive me,

if I solicit their attention to this kind of proof a little longer.

Such modes of expression, as *from hence*—*from whence*—*from thence*, occur in all parts of the writings of Burke and of Junius, and lead to the same conclusion, with those peculiarities, of which I have already taken notice. Indeed, it is the uniform regularity, with which these faults occur, in the works of both, that makes the argument drawn from these sources so very strong and conclusive. Such expressions as the above are incorrect as they are tautologous. The word *hence* means “from this place,” *thence* “from that place,” &c.; so that the word *from* prefixed to either of them is redundant; a defect, which Dr. Johnson long since pointed out to his contemporaries. And yet the following examples will show how great a favourite it was with Junius and Burke. In the former the following instances may be seen:—“I should be glad to know, by what kind of reasoning it can be proved, that there is a power vested in the representative to destroy his immediate constituent: *from whence* could he possibly derive it?”—“You ask me, *from whence* did the right originate, and for what purpose was it granted?” “*From thence* it will appear clearly, &c.” “This doctrine of Lord



Chief Justice Hale refers immediately to the superior courts, *from whence* the writ issues.” “A key was found in his room there, which appeared to be the key of the closet, at Guildhall, *from whence* the paper was stolen.” “Every one will acknowledge, that Lord Townshend was at Quebec; for every one remembers his letter *from thence*.” “Our countrymen derive *from thence* a firmness, &c.” “*From thence* arose that desperate proceeding, which has given such an universal alarm to property.” “An officer hitherto little heard of, but *from henceforth* to be a name of dreadful note in this country.” “His first appearance in the great world was as one of Lord Barrington’s domestics, *from whence* he moved to Ireland, set up a shop, &c.” If the reader will look into the note, he will find references in abundance to some of those parts of Mr. Burke’s writings, where similar instances occur\*. The three following are from his Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents—“Returned again to the great ocean, *from whence* it arose.” “*From whence* few have had the good fortune to escape.” “Speedily to

\* Examples are so numerous in all parts of his works, that I shall content myself with a few references, without transcribing any:—of vol. iii. see pp. 38, 60, 63, 78, 84, 87, 109, 120, 183, 298, 312, 333. See of vol. vi. pp. 134, 250, 259, 365, 367. Vol. vii. pp. 103, &c. &c.

be resolved into the mass *from whence* it arose." The reader will also find specimens in his speech on American Taxation: thus—"It was in America that your resolutions were pre-declared. It was *from thence*, that we knew to a certainty, &c." "In all those acts the system of commerce is established, as that, *from whence* alone you proposed to make the colonies contribute, &c." "I venture to say, that, during that whole period, a parliamentary revenue *from thence* was never once in contemplation." "Do you mean to tax America, and to draw a productive revenue *from thence*?"

I have already remarked, that one of the effects of the inverted construction, so common in Burke and Junius, was to place words of trifling meaning, and of no importance as to the effects produced by their sound on the ear, at the end of phrases and sentences. But, independently of that, I have now to remark, that they are both in the constant habit of concluding sentences and even paragraphs with such words, even where the inverted construction does not occur, and where this defect might have been easily avoided. "The Americans will have no interest contrary to the grandeur and glory of England, when they are not oppressed by the weight *of it*."

If he had said,—“ *When they are not oppressed by its weight*”—the meaning would be as complete, and the harmony and cadence more perfect. I may here remark, that Burke and Junius both constantly use, without any necessity, and with the same bad effect, as in this instance, the words *of it* instead of *its*, as the reader will be able to perceive in the next, and in several of the following examples. Instances occur in all parts of their works. “Then this unpleasant and unhandsome consequence will follow, that you judge of the delinquency of men, merely by the time of their guilt, and not by the heinousness *of it*.” (Instead of *its* heinousness). The following sentence concludes a paragraph—“But, by being removed from our persons, they have rooted in our laws; and the latest posterity will taste the fruits *of them*.” It was very easy for the writer to avoid this tasteless termination: thus—“and the fruits of them will be tasted by the latest posterity.” We know very well, that most, if not all, of their compositions were highly laboured both by Junius and by Burke: when, therefore, we find a defect like this run through the whole of their writings, we must be satisfied, that it proceeded from a want of taste and not from design, or from art. I shall give some farther specimens from each, without any comments

upon them. "I should forfeit the only thing, which makes you pardon so many errors and imperfections *in me*." "Am I not to avail myself of whatever good is to be found in the world, because of the mixture of evil that will always be *in it*?" "But, when the reason of old establishments is gone, it is absurd to preserve nothing but the burden *of them*." "The audit of the exchequer demands proofs, which in the nature of things, are difficult, sometimes impossible *to be had*." "They are antidotes against a corrupt levity, instead of causes *of it*." "I think myself bound to give you my reasons as clearly and as fully, for stopping in the course of reformation, as for proceeding *in it*." "I will even go so far as to affirm, that, if men were willing to serve in such situations without salary, they ought not to be permitted *to do it*." "The noble Lord lamented very justly, that this statesman, of so much mental vigour, was almost wholly disabled from the exertion *of it*." "When the new plan is established, those, who are now suitors for jobs, will become the most strenuous opposers *of them*." "Having found the advantage of assassination in the formation of their tyranny, it is the grand resource, in which they trust, for the support *of it*." "I was, without any call of mine, consulted both on your side of

the water and *on this*.” “No man, on reading that bill, could imagine he was reading an act of amnesty and indulgence, following a recital of the good behaviour of those, who are the objects *of it*.” “It is in a great measure to this, &c. that the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland have been prevented from becoming an intolerable nuisance to the country, instead of being, as, I conceive, they generally are, a very great service *to it*.”

Let us now compare with these examples, taken from the writings of Mr. Burke, the following from the letters of Junius. “Good men, to whom alone I address myself, appear to me to consult their piety, as little as their judgment and experience, when they admit the great and essential advantages accruing to society from the freedom of the press, yet indulge themselves in peevish or passionate exclamations against the abuses *of it*.” He concludes the paragraph, which immediately precedes this extract, in his preface, in the following manner: “I speak to the plain understanding of the people, and appeal to their honest, liberal construction *of me*.” “I cannot conceive, that there is a heart so callous, or an understanding so depraved, as to attend to a discourse of this nature, and not to

feel the force *of it*." " You soon forced him to leave you to yourself, and to withdraw his name from an administration, which had been formed on the credit *of it*." " The man, who is conscious of the weakness of his cause, is interested in concealing it : and, on the other side, it is not uncommon to see a good cause mangled by advocates, who do not know the real strength *of it*." " Reason may be applied to show the impropriety, or expedience of a law, but we must have either a statute, or precedent, to prove the existence *of it*." " As to G. A. I observe first, that if he did not admit of Junius's state of the question, he should have shown the fallacy *of it*." " You cannot but know, sir, that what was Mr. Wilkes's case yesterday may be yours or mine to-morrow, and that, consequently, the common right of every subject of the realm is invaded *by it*." " Had he been a father, he would have been but little offended with the severity of the reproach, for his mind would have been filled with the justice *of it*." " His Grace had all the proper feelings of a father, though he took care to suppress the appearance *of them*." " Nor is it from any natural confusion in their ideas, that they are so ready to confound the original of a king, with the disgraceful representation *of him*." " As we are Englishmen, the least con-



siderable man among us has an interest equal to the proudest nobleman, in the laws and constitution of his country, and is equally called upon to make a generous contribution in support *of them*." "Intoxicated with pleasure, they wasted their inheritance in pursuit *of it*." "The ablest men of all parties engage in the question, and exert their utmost abilities in the discussion *of it*."

*Of it* was so great a favourite with Junius and with Burke, that they use it instead of *its*, not only at the end, but in all parts of their sentences. Thus in these examples : "They complained of an act of the legislature, but traced the origin *of it* no higher than to the servants of the crown." "I have received the favour of your note ; from the contents *of it* I imagine you may have something to communicate to me." "Whether, or no, there be a secret system in the closet, and what may be the object *of it*, are questions, which can only be determined by appearances, and on which every man must decide for himself." "How remarkable it is, that you have never yet formed a friendship, which has not been fatal to the object *of it*, nor adopted a cause, to which, one way or other, you have not done mischief." "One good effect at least would have been immediately produced *by it*."

“ Hereafter we shall know the value *of it.*” “ I extorted new taxes from you before it was possible they could be wanted, and am now unable to account for the application *of them.*” “ In some men there is a malignant passion to destroy the works of genius, literature, and freedom. The *Vandal* and the *Monk* find equal gratification *in it.*” “ That he has no possible resource, but in the public favour, is, in my judgment, a considerable recommendation *of him.*” “ It bore the appearance of a royal bounty, but had nothing real *in it.*” “ That he would have been pardoned seems more than probable, if I had not directed the public attention to the leading step you took *in favour of him.*” “ Why the Earl of Chatham should continue to hold an employment of this importance, while he is unable to perform the duties *of it,* is, at least, a curious question.” “ Or when you declared, that there was not a man in the army fit to be trusted with the command *of it.*” “ The army, indeed, is come to a fine pass, with a gambling broker at the head *of it.*” This number of examples, I am persuaded, will be sufficient. If they are not all proofs of a want of taste, they will help to shew, in conjunction with the various other kinds of peculiarities already exemplified, such a prevailing coincidence of

manner, between Burke and Junius, as it will be difficult to point out between any other two distinguished writers.

Before I conclude this part of my inquiry, there are two peculiarities more, out of many others, to which I shall briefly allude. The first is, the use of the expression—*whether or no*,—which is incorrect, instead of—*whether or not*. In the following extract from Mr. Burke's letter to Lord Kenmare we find an example not only of this, but also of two others of the peculiarities already mentioned. “At present I am much in the dark with regard to the state of the country, *which the intended law is to be applied to*. It is not easy for me to determine *whether or no* it was wise (for the sake of expunging the black letter of laws, which, menacing as they were in the language, were every day fading into disuse) solemnly to re-affirm the principles, and to re-enact the provisions of a code of statutes, by which you are totally excluded from the privileges of the commonwealth, from the highest to the lowest, from the most material of the civil professions, from the army, and even from education, where alone education *is to be had*.” For brevity's sake I shall content myself with this example from Burke. The following are

from Junius. "That Swinney is a wretched, but a dangerous fool. He had the impudence to go to Lord G. Sackville, *whom he had never spoken to*, and to ask him *whether or no* he was the author of Junius." "He told the jury, in so many words, that they had nothing to determine, except the fact of printing and publishing, and *whether or no* the blanks, or innuendos, were properly filled up." (Vol. i. p. 15.) "You are by no means undeserving of notice; and it may be of consequence, even to Lord Granby, to have it determined, *whether or no* the man, who has praised him so lavishly, be himself deserving of praise." (Ibid. p. 77.) "I take the question to be strictly this: *whether or no* it be the known, established law of Parliament, &c." (Ibid. p. 174, and also at p. 190.) "The only question we ask is, *whether or no* it be true." (Ibid. p. 196.) "Without dwelling longer upon a most invidious subject, I shall leave it to military men, who have seen a service more active than the parade, to determine, *whether or no* I speak truth." (Vol. ii. p. 42.) The reader will find further examples in the following pages of the same volume: (88, 117, 202, 371.) The following is the last which I shall mention; it is taken from the third volume. "Have they made any agreement with the East India company? No. Have they made any provision for

outstanding navy and victualling bills ? I answer they must, *whether they will or no.*"

Although I have scarcely as yet exhausted a tenth part of my materials, the defect which is exemplified in the following extracts, is the last upon which I shall touch at present. But, should the public call for a second edition of this Inquiry, it is my intention to enlarge further on the subject, at some future time.

Whenever an article is prefixed to a participle, the participle assumes the nature of a substantive, and ought to be governed by those rules of construction, which grammarians have laid down for governing the construction of substantives. Thus, in this instance, "*It is virtually a begging of the question,*"—the article *a* prefixed to it converts the participle *begging* into a substantive, and the writer has properly introduced the sign of the possessive case *of* before the word *question*, which is the substantive immediately following. If, after using the article *a* before *begging*, he had left out the preposition *of*, the sentence would be grammatically incorrect. It would be also incorrect had he left out the *a*, and written thus : "*It is virtually begging of the question.*" If either the article, or the preposition, be used, the construction is faulty

without the other: so that there are two ways of constructing such sentences, which are incorrect. There are also two ways, in which they may be written correctly; the manner, for instance, in which the sentence stands, as I have quoted it above, and the following: "It is virtually begging the question." In this last case, the word *begging* retaining its participial form is correctly followed, not by the possessive, but by the words, *the question*, in the objective case. These rules are constantly violated by Junius and by Burke. "But it is impossible he should be so far active in his own dishonour, as to advise *the taking away an employment*, given as a reward for the first military success that distinguished his entrance into administration." The writer ought to have said—"the taking away *of an employment*, &c." "It seems, that they had hoarded up those unmeaning powers of the crown, as a grand military magazine towards the breaking the fortunes," (*the breaking of the fortunes*,) "and depressing the spirit of the nobility." "Lord North informed the House of Commons, &c. that he intended to move for a farther augmentation of ten thousand seamen, and that, at any rate, he should advise *the keeping up the* naval and military force upon the augmented establishment." It is not necessary



to quote farther from Junius. The following examples are from Mr. Burke:—" *The lessening and granting away some part of her revenue, by Parliament, was alledged as the cause of that debt, and pleaded as an equitable ground, (such it certainly was) for discharging it.*" "He will therefore excuse my adding something more towards *the further clearing up a point*, which the great convenience of obscurity to dishonesty has been able to cover with some degree of darkness and of doubt." " *The not paying more frequent visits here.*" " *The teaching school, an useful and virtuous occupation, even the teaching in a private family was in every catholic subjected to the same unproportioned punishment.*" "And it will be vain to think of saving *of it.*" (In this example the second *of* is unnecessary.) "A statute was fabricated, in the year 1699, by which *the saying mass* was forged into a crime punishable with perpetual imprisonment." "This, I said, is equal in importance to *the securing a government according to law.*" "And, though he was aware, that *the handling such matters* in parliament was delicate, yet, &c." "That it should render *the incurring debts* on the civil establishment so very difficult, as to become next to impracticable." "But if a great body of the people, who contribute to this state lot-

tery, are excluded from all the prizes, *the stopping the circulation* with regard to them may be a most cruel hardship." " *The taking away of a vote is the taking away the shield*, which the subject has, not only against the oppression of power, but, that worst of all oppressions, the persecution of private society and private manners." " This mode will, on the one hand, prevent *the unfixing old interests* at once." " As to the time, I have some doubts, whether it is not rather unfavourable *to the issuing any manifesto*, with regard to the intended government of France." Thus much will be sufficient at present on this head. If after so many examples as I have given of a coincidence, not merely in style and opinions, but also in grammatical errors and in false taste, any of the readers of this essay should be still so difficult of conviction, as not to be strongly inclined to suspect, that the Letters of Junius were written by Mr. Burke, I must confess I do not believe, that it would be possible to convince them, by any further specimens of this kind, or by any arguments drawn from these, or from similar sources. I shall, therefore, now pass on to evidence of another kind, from which, I hope, some of my readers will derive more satisfaction.

During the time of the original appearance of the Letters in the Public Advertiser, Mr. Burke was the person most suspected for being the writer; so much so, indeed, that most of those, who wrote answers to them in the public papers, either insinuated, or directly affirmed, that he was the author. It was natural for them to entertain this suspicion, as the opinions of Junius coincided in general with those of Mr. Burke, who was, at that time, known to be an able political writer, and certainly the most eloquent speaker in the House of Commons. It is well known, that, for many years before the letters of Junius appeared, Mr. Burke was a constant writer in the public journals; and we are informed, by Bissett, in his Life, that he was indebted for the friendship and patronage of the Marquis of Rockingham to his essays and writings in the Public Advertiser\*. According to the last editor of Junius, the seventh communication, sent by that writer to the Public Advertiser, was of the date of the 22d of October, 1767; that

\* Another of his biographers informs us, that "he and his brother Richard, assisted by his relation William Burke, published several papers in defence of the Rockingham party, in the Gazetteer, under various signatures, from the year 1766 to 1768. Some of those papers were written in answer to Scott, of Cambridge, who appeared at the time under the signature of *Antesejanus*."

is one year and three months before the publication of the first *Junius*. This communication is written in the form of a dialogue, in which the writer pretends to give an account of what passed at a meeting of the Privy Council, assembled at the Earl of Shelburne's, for the purpose of drawing up a set of instructions for Lord Townshend, who was just appointed to the government of Ireland. As it was known, that they had several meetings on this subject, without being able (so distracted and divided were they among themselves) to agree upon any regular plan for the guidance of his Lordship, Junius availed himself of the circumstance, and made it the foundation of a sarcastic, witty, violent, and able attack upon the ministry. To this communication he gave the title of "*Grand Council upon the Affairs of Ireland after eleven Adjournments.*" It is written with great spirit, satire, and ability; and was well calculated to make the ministry contemptible and ridiculous. Of this, too, they seem to have been themselves fully aware, as an answer to it was immediately published by them, giving, what the author called, *a true account of a grand council in Hill-street*. This pretended true account, which also appeared in the Public Advertiser, was attributed by Junius, and by the public, to Lord Shelburne, or to some body writing under his

immediate instructions. After the council are supposed to have determined upon the instructions to be given to Lord Townshend, the writer of *the true account* makes the Lord President to address them as follows.

President. *Lord Northampton*

“ If nothing further occurs to your excellency, nor to you, my Lords, upon the present business, it will be time, I believe, for us to break up.”—

(*As the Council are rising a Secretary enters.*)

*Secretary.*

“ My Lords, there is a person without, who says he has business of a private nature, and earnestly desires to be admitted.”

*S. S.*

“ Do you know who the man is? Are you acquainted with his person?”

*Secretary.*

“ I am, my Lord: but, as he desires, in case your Lordships do not think fit to see him, that his visit may be kept a secret, I beg to be excused mentioning his name: I believe he is personally known to every one present.”

*Omnes.*

“ Let him come in.”

*(The Secretary goes out and returns introducing a tall, ill-looking fellow, in a shabby black coat.*

*Lord President.*

“ What are your commands with us, Mr. Brazen ?”

*Brazen.* Burke

“ The business, my Lords, that has brought me thus unexpectedly into your company, will, I am persuaded, excuse the unseasonableness of my intrusion. I flatter myself I am known, well known, to every one of your Lordships. My part has not been an obscure one : I may say, with the *sublimest* of all poets, “ *Not to know me, &c.*”

In the remainder of the dialogue the author of the true account goes on to represent Mr. Brazen (that is Mr. Burke) as offering to abandon his own party, for the mere purposes of gain, and to go over to the ministry. This proposal is rejected by the council with contempt and indignation ; and one of the Secretaries of State (Lord Shelburne, in whose house the council was held),



is represented as ordering Mr. Burke out of the house in these words, with which the dialogue concludes.

S. S.

“ Here : who waits there ? Take this fellow and put him out of the house.”

*(Exit Brazen between two footmen.)*

Immediately after the publication of the true account, containing the above attack upon Mr. Burke, (that is on the 31st of October, 1767) the following letter from Junius appeared in the Public Advertiser. It merits particular attention from this circumstance, that it was an answer from Junius to an article, in which a direct attack had been made upon Mr. Burke, with a view to represent him as a vile and unprincipled party man, and in which the former communication of Junius was attributed to that gentleman. Under these circumstances what does Junius do ? Does he say, that the account of the *grand council*, &c. was not written by Mr. Burke ? No such thing. Does he acquiesce in the imputations, which the author of the true account wished to fix upon Mr. Burke ? By no means ; for, although he does not conspicuously say any thing of the direct charge of apostacy brought

against Mr. Burke, well knowing were he to acknowledge its truth, or to condemn its falsehood, that this would go very far towards identifying him with that gentleman, he yet touches pretty feelingly upon the attempt made to ridicule Mr. Burke's *shabby black coat*, and turns his own weapon of raillery against the fine clothes and official situation of Lord Shelburne, by whom he evidently supposed the true account to be either written, or dictated. It is for this reason partly, that he almost exclusively attacks Lord Shelburne in this reply, and charges him directly with foppery and want of modesty, at the same time that he speaks slightly of his wit and abilities. Whilst he re-affirms, *and even more forcibly*, than he had done in his original account of *the grand council in Hill-street*, his charges against the ministry, he converts his reply into a more direct and personal attack upon Lord Shelburne, the supposed author of the former attack upon Mr. Burke, which shews pretty clearly, that he wished to be revenged upon his Lordship for his hostility to that gentleman. To enable the reader to judge of the fairness of my comments upon this letter, I shall present him with a copy of the entire of it. It was as follows.

## TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR,

October 31, 1767.

Your correspondent, who has furnished you with what he calls a true account of a grand council in Hill-street, does not appear to me to have done much service to his patrons. The former dialogue had at least some pleasantry (though not enough, I dare say, to draw a smile from the parties concerned) and, perhaps, in marking the characters a little too much truth. But this sorrowful rogue is too dull to be witty, and, *as for truth, I suppose it would neither suit his argument, nor his disposition. His raillery upon a shabby black coat is, indeed, delicate to an extreme; but he forgets, that wit and abilities have as little connection with rich clothes, as they have with great places, and that a man may wear a fine suit, or figure as a secretary of state, without a single grain of either.* But, sir, if facts asserted are notoriously false, the assertion of them can do no mischief; if notoriously true, they are beyond the reach of his wit, if he had any, to palliate, or of his modesty, which I think is upon a par with his wit,—to deny. Now, sir, if I were not afraid of distressing him too much, I would ask him, whether Lord Townshend

did not openly complain, only three days before his departure, that he could not by the warmest solicitations, prevail upon the ministry to agree upon any one system of instructions for him; that he was left entirely to himself; and that the ministry could not be persuaded to pay the smallest attention, either to his situation, or to that of the country he was sent to govern. Did he not say this, without reserve, to every man he met, even in public court, and with all possible marks of resentment and disgust? *I would advise your second correspondent not to deny these known facts; for, if he does, I will assuredly produce some proofs of them, which will gall his patrons a little more, than any thing they have seen already. Let ONE OF THEM only recollect what sort of conversation very lately passed between him and the Lord Lieutenant; how he was pressed, and how he evaded\*.* But the facts, of which the public are already possessed, sufficiently speak for themselves, and the nation wants no further proof of the weakness, ignorance, irresolution, and spirit

\* Notwithstanding this direct attack upon Lord Shelburne, he and the partizans of the ministry remained silent; thinking it better, no doubt, to hold their tongues, than to provoke their invisible opponent to the publication of those facts, with which he threatens them here. Their silence is a proof, that they knew him to be acquainted with some of their proceedings, which they did not wish to be made known to the public.

of discord, which reign triumphant in this illustrious divan, who have dared to take upon them the conduct of an empire.

“ One question more, and I have done. Did it become him, who has undertaken the defence of a whole ministry, to forget one of the principal characters of the piece? Why should he omit the Dog? This mongrel, that barks, and bites, and fawns, has nevertheless a share in council, *and, in the opinion of the best judges, cuts full as good a figure in it as his master* \*.

“ *Here : who waits there † ? O charming antithesis ! O polished language ! and equally fit for the noble Lord, who speaks, or for the foot-man, who hears it.*”

\* The Dog, or Mongrel here alluded to, was *Bane* who resided in the family of Lord Shelburne, and was employed frequently in writing political essays under his Lordship's direction. Junius, in his account of the *grand council*, represents Lord Northington as awakened by the barking of this dog, and saying to Lord Shelburne:—“ Zounds, my Lord, do you keep bull-dogs in your house ?”—To which Malagrida, or Lord Shelburne, replies:—“ No, my Lord, it is but a mongrel. Your true English bull-dog never quits his hold ; but this cur plays fast and loose just as I bid him : *He worries a man one moment, and fawns upon him the next.*”

† Lord Shelburne's words, when he calls the servants to turn out Brazen, or Mr. Burke.

What could have induced Junius, in this letter, to single out Lord Shelburne and his mongrel, as the sole objects of his attack and ridicule, supposing him and Burke to be different persons, it is not easy to conjecture. It could not be, surely, for having attributed his former letter to Mr. Burke; for it is not at all probable, that Junius could feel mortified at having one of his compositions ascribed to a man, who was, even at that time, acknowledged to be the best political writer, as well as the most eloquent speaker in the kingdom. But if we suppose Burke and Junius to be the same person, there is no difficulty; for it was then very natural for the latter to feel hurt at any attempts made to injure the reputation of the former. And, though it was not very easy for him to be revenged on Lord Shelburne for the attack upon Mr. Burke, without giving room for suspecting, that his letter was written by the latter, it must be confessed, that he managed it with considerable dexterity and success, when we find, that he completely silenced and gagged the ministry.

As a farther confirmation of my opinion, that this letter was written by Mr. Burke, it is well known that he always disliked Lord Shelburne.



Some of this nobleman's opponents, though ready enough to do credit to his abilities, accused him of insincerity and duplicity, and gave him the name of the *Jesuit* or *Malagrida*, on that account. Burke's dislike to Lord Shelburne, we may be sure, was not lessened by his becoming Secretary of State in that ministry, which succeeded the Rockingham administration, and which by its ready acceptance of office, contributed in a great degree to their dismissal. Bisset, after mentioning the friendship always entertained by Burke and Lord North for one another, though political enemies, adds these words:—"On the other hand, there were some of his political associates, whom he privately disliked; one nobleman, in particular, generally accused of duplicity, he always carefully avoided as a *Jesuit*."

I am, therefore, upon a fair and candid view of the whole, satisfied in my own mind, that both these communications, which we now know to have been sent, by his private correspondent C, to Mr. Woodfall, were written by Mr. Burke.

The fourth communication of Junius in the *Public Advertiser*, according to the new editor, but not the fourth in my opinion, as I shall

prove another time, is an attack upon the brothers Lord and Charles Townshend \*. It is concluded thus :—" Are these the pair, who are to give stability to a wavering favourite and permanency to a *locum tenens administration* ? Alas ! alas ! *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis tempus eget :*"—

" And is it by such a prop that Grafton thinks to stand, after throwing down his idol Pitt, at whose false altar he had before sacrificed his friends. Is it for such a man that Conway foregoes the connections of his youth and the friends of his best and ripest judgment ? *O tempora ! O mores !*"

There is no man of that time, from whom such a passage as this could come more natu-

\* Junius says, that he was well acquainted with this *par Nobile fratrum*, and, we must not forget, that Mr. Burke also knew them both well. I shall mention only one reason at present to show, that this attack upon Charles Townshend may be very naturally expected from Mr. Burke, who certainly was the leading man and best advocate of the Rockingham party. When the Rockingham ministry came into office, Charles Townshend, being asked what he thought of it, said, that it was " a lutestrung administration and might last perhaps the summer ; but would never do for winter." A remark, which, we may take it for granted, could not be at all pleasing to Mr. Burke. Charles Townshend was made Chancellor of the Exchequer in the chequered ministry of Lord Chatham, and even in that way may be supposed to have contributed, in part, to the disappointment of Mr. Burke.

rally than from Mr. Burke. His opinion of the chequered and speckled administration of Lord Chatham, in 1766, is well known and remembered. That his Lordship's acceptance of office at that time, when the favourite could prevail upon nobody else to come in, and that too in union with the Duke of Grafton, which divided the Rockingham party, must have sorely mortified Mr. Burke was natural; for it was the signal for Lord Rockingham's dismissal, and a complete bar to the hopes which, with his abilities and connections, it was impossible for Mr. Burke not to entertain of rising higher in the state. It was, therefore, to be expected, that Burke, who certainly was not devoid of ambition, should dislike this disappointment of his hopes, particularly when he knew, that Mr. Pitt had it in his power, either by refusing to come into office at the time, or by uniting with them, instead of dividing them, to give permanency to the Rockingham administration. Were we to suppose Burke writing in his own name he could hardly speak more feelingly for his own party, or reproach those who deserted it, with more apparent sincerity and disappointment, than Junius does, when he accuses the Duke of Grafton for having sacrificed his friends at the false altar of his idol, Pitt, and Mr. Conway, for abandoning "the connections

of his youth, and the friends of his best and ripest judgment."

As Mr. Burke enjoyed little or no hereditary property, and was not brought up to any regular profession, we may suppose from the zeal with which he devoted himself very early to political writing, that all his views were directed to promotion in the state. Although, at the dismissal of Lord Rockingham, he was placed above want, he was not, however, so affluent as not to be fully sensible, that it was both desirable and necessary for him to mend and enlarge his fortune. Whatever hopes, however, of this kind we may suppose him to have entertained before that event, must at that time have abandoned him, and that too for a period of which it was impossible for him to ascertain the limits. Such a disappointment at his time of life must sorely mortify any man ; and we may safely conclude, that it had its full effect on the highly sensible mind of Mr. Burke. In such circumstances, therefore, it was not to be expected, that he could entertain much respect for those, who, he must have known, contributed most to the downfall of his friends and his own disappointment. And, accordingly, I cannot help thinking it a pretty strong coincidence in favour of his claims,

that the very persons, whom Junius makes the chief objects of his abuse and invectives, and regards with the greatest abhorrence, were those, to whom it was natural for Burke to be hostile, as being the chief causes of the removal of his party from office, or the only obstacles that prevented their return to power\*. We all know how unmercifully Junius has belaboured the Duke of Grafton and Lord Bute. From whom could this be more naturally expected than from Mr. Burke? It was to the secret influence of the latter, and to the desertion of the former, that, he knew, they were indebted for the dismissal of Lord Rockingham's administration.

The circumstance, which immediately led to their dismissal from office, was as follows:—It was owing to the advice of the Lord Chancellor Northington. The ministry were engaged in

\* Of this the reader has already had some proof in the extracts made from the account of *the Grand Council in Hill-street on the affairs of Ireland, after eleven adjournments*. He will find it further confirmed, by looking into the *fifth* of the Miscellaneous Letters, in which he gives very satirical portraits of the leading members of that ministry, by which the Rockingham party were turned out; thus of the Duke of Grafton, Lords Chatham, Camden, Northington, and Shelburne; of the Marquis of Granby, Mr. Conway, Thomas Townshend, Sir Gilbert Elliot, and Lord Barrington. See also the new edition *passim*. This matter will be further illustrated in subsequent parts of this Inquiry.

forming a constitution for the recently conquered province of Canada; and Burke had sketched a plan for the purpose—On being shewn to the Chancellor Northington, he condemned it in the most explicit manner; and going to the King, told him, that his ministers were totally inexperienced in business, and unfit for office. The King, upon this, commissioned him to consult with Mr. Pitt on the formation of a new administration; in consequence of which Mr. Pitt consented to come into office, and Lord Rockingham's party were immediately after dismissed. After condemning so explicitly Mr. Burke's sketch for the constitution of Canada, and being the immediate cause of the dismissal of the Rockingham party from office, it was not to be expected, that he could entertain much tenderness, or respect, for Lord Northington: It is, therefore, well worthy of remark, as serving in a strong degree to identify Burke with Junius, that the latter has been as severely revenged of Lord Northington, as it was possible even for the former to desire; and that too in one of his earliest communications, in the *Public Advertiser*. The letter, to which I allude, is the account of the *grand council on the affairs of Ireland after eleven adjournments*, in which Junius, under the name of *Tilbury*, represents Lord Northington in the character of



a drunken and a stupid blasphemer. The following are the speeches which he puts in his mouth. “*In the name of the devil and his dam*, can any body tell what accident brings us five together?” This is his opening speech. The next is with respect to the instructions to be given to Lord Townshend, on which *Tilbury* says—“*Blast me*, if I care, whether he has any instructions or not. But *who the devil’s* to draw them up?” And again: “*Blast me* if I know any thing of the matter.” (*falls asleep.*) On being wakened, by the barking of a dog, he says, starting up—“*Zounds*, my Lord, do you keep bulldogs in your house?” His last speech is when he declines listening to *Malagrida* in these words: “No, *damn me*, ’tis a little too late, I thank you. (*Aside.*) This silly puppy takes me for his schoolmaster, and fancies I am obliged to hear him repeat his task to me.” *Exit.*

Most of the readers of Junius, I mean the readers of all the old editions, are not aware, that he attacked Mr. Pitt as severely as he did Lord Bute and the Duke of Grafton. They remember his fine (though conditional and qualified) panegyric of Lord Chatham; but, if they look into the new edition, they will find, that he has poured forth against him, as it is expressed

by Sterne, almost every name vituperative under heaven. Indeed, if we take the word of the new editor, the *two first* communications, which Junius ever sent to the Public Advertiser, were dreadful philippics against Lord Chatham ; but whether they were the first, or not, I must own, so great is their severity, that, in my mind, there was no other source, at that time, from which they could be more naturally expected to flow, than from the disappointed hopes and ambition of Mr. Burke. Anxious as he must have been, on his own account, for the continuation of the Rockingham administration, it was quite natural for Mr. Burke to be offended at Mr. Pitt's acceptance of office at that time, as he knew, had he joined with the Rockingham party, instead of forming his patched up ministry, that they might command their own terms, and destroy the influence of the favourite for ever.

In the first of these letters, Junius compares him to a dictator, striving to perpetuate his own power, and to trample on the liberties of his country. The following short extracts will shew how he treats him. “ But if, instead of a man of a common mixed character, whose vices might be redeemed by some appearance of virtue and generosity, it should have unfortunately hap-

pened, that a nation had placed all their confidence in *a man purely and perfectly bad, &c. &c.* The history of every nation, that once had a claim to liberty, will tell us *what would be the progress of such a traitor*, and what the probable event of his crimes.” “ But it is in the natural course of things, that a despotic power, which of itself violates every principle of a free constitution, should be acquired by means, which *equally violate every principle of honour and morality.*” “ The same measures, by which *an abandoned profligate* is advanced to power, must be observed to maintain him in it.” He then proceeds to condemn him for forming his ministry without the concurrence and aid of the leading whigs and the principal nobility ; a topic, upon which Mr. Burke afterwards touched, in his *Thoughts on the Cause of the present Discontents.* In his second letter he attacks Lord Chatham for his acceptance of a title, or, to use the words of Mr. Wilkes, of a place, a peerage, and a pension. In another place he remarks :—“ Your correspondent of yesterday, Mr. Macaroni, in his account of the new ministerial arrangements, has thrust in a laboured bombast panegyric on the Earl of Chatham ; in which he tells us—“ that this country owes more to him than it can ever repay.” Now, Mr. Woodfall, I en-

tirely agree with Mr. Macaroni, that this country *does* owe more to Lord Chatham than it can ever repay ; for to *him* we owe the greatest part of the national debt ; and *that*, I am sure, we never can repay. I mean no offence to Mr. Macaroni, nor any of your *gentlemen* authors, who are so kind as to give *us citizens* \* an *early* peep behind the political curtain ; but I cannot bear to see so much incense offered to *an idol, who so little deserves it.*"

The following extract is from the third communication of Junius, containing an attack on Lord Bute, and goes a good way, I think, towards identifying Junius with Mr. Burke. " It is worth while to consider, though perhaps not safe to point out, by what arts it has been possible for him (Lord Bute) to maintain himself so long in power, and to screen himself from the national justice. Some of them have been obvious enough ; the rest may without difficulty be guessed at. But, whatever they are, *it is not above a twelvemonth ago, since they might have all been defeated, and the venomous spider itself*

\* It is a coincidence, which deserves to be remarked, that Mr. Burke, in his ironical letter, signed Whittington, which contained a very humorous and severe attack on Lord Chatham, said that he himself was a citizen.

*caught and trampled on in its own webs. It was then his good fortune to corrupt one man, from whom we least of all expected so base an apostacy.* Who, indeed, could have expected, that it should ever consist with the spirit, or understanding, of that person to accept of a share of power under a pernicious court minion, whom he himself had affected to detest, or despise, as much as he knew he was detested and despised by the whole nation? I will not censure him for the avarice of a pension, nor the melancholy ambition of a title. These were objects, which he, perhaps, looked up to, though the rest of the world thought them far beneath his acceptance\*.” Had Mr. Burke been writing on the same subject, it would be difficult for him, in my opinion, to deprecate and to lament more feelingly Lord Chatham’s acceptance of office, in the manner in which it was effected, or to point more directly than Junius does in this passage, to a union between him and the friends of Lord Rockingham.

\* It ought not to be forgotten here, how severely Mr. Burke attacked Lord Chatham about the same time, in his celebrated ironical letter, signed Whittington, from which I have made some extracts in a preceding part of this tract, (see pp. 69, 70), and which, it is well known, contributed greatly to sink his Lordship’s popularity in the city.

We know, that Mr. Burke wished to see this country always governed by an aristocracy of property and of talents, which should principally consist of the representatives of those whig families who had been most active in bringing about the Revolution. Junius, in one of his *Miscellaneous Letters*, after noticing some calumnies and scurrilities, that had been poured forth against the whigs, in the ministerial writings, concludes thus:—"This ought to be the inviolable rule, where the question is concerning offices of trust, which require weight and ability for their execution. When the question is concerning the mere graces of the crown, the rule is to become, even more severe ; and every lover of the constitution must think it a crime, hardly less than treason, in those, who shall advise a court to discountenance the families which have promoted the revolution, and at the same time to load with its favours those, who, (reconciled by profit, not by opinion), have ever been the declared enemies both of the Revolution and of every benefit we derive from that happy event."

I shall add but one extract more from Junius, before I solicit the attention of my readers to a document, which, if I do not deceive myself very much, will set the controversy concerning



the author of Junius for ever at rest. It is taken from one of his letters, signed *Domitian*, and is a fair and exact summary of some of the leading parts of Mr. Burke's tract on the Cause of the Present Discontents. This will appear evident, from comparing it even with those extracts from that tract, which the reader has seen in a preceding part of this Inquiry. "His majesty, God bless him! has now got rid of every man, whose former services, or present scruples, could be supposed to give offence to her Royal Highness the Princess Dowager of Wales. The security of our civil and religious liberties cannot be more happily provided for, than while Lord Mansfield pronounces the law, and Lord Sandwich represents the religion of St. James's. Such law and such religion are too closely united to suffer even a momentary intervention of common honesty between them. Her Royal Highness's scheme of government, formed long before her husband's death, is now accomplished. She has succeeded in disuniting every party, and dissolving every connection; and, by the mere influence of the crown, has formed an administration, such as it is, out of the refuse of them all. There are two leading principles in the politics of St. James's, which will account for almost every measure of government since the King's accession. The

first is, that the prerogative is sufficient to make a lackey a prime minister, and to maintain him in that post, without any regard to the welfare, or to the opinion of the people. The second is, that none but persons, insignificant in themselves, or of tainted reputation, should be brought into employment. Men of greater consequence and abilities will have opinions of their own, and will not submit to the meddling, unnatural ambition of a mother, who grasps at unlimited power at the hazard of her son's destruction. They will not suffer measures of public utility, which have been resolved upon in council, to be checked and controuled by a secret influence in the closet. Such men, consequently, will never be called upon but in cases of extreme necessity. When that ceases, they will find their places no longer tenable. To answer the purposes of an ambitious woman, an administration must be formed of more pliant materials,—of men, who having no connection with each other, no personal interest, no weight, or consideration with the people, may separately depend upon the smiles of the crown alone for their advancement to high offices, and for their continuance there. If such men resist the Princess Dowager's pleasure, his Majesty knows, that he may dismiss them without risking any thing from their re-

sentment. His wisdom suggests to him, that, if he were to choose his ministers for any of those qualities, which might entitle them to public esteem, the nation might take part with them and resent their dismissal. As it is, whenever he changes his servants, he is sure to have the people, in that instance, on his side."

When I first formed the resolution of writing this Inquiry concerning the author of Junius, I was fully aware, that I imposed no very pleasing task upon myself.—I knew, that the undertaking would require much reading and the exertion of memory rather than great genius, much profundity of thinking, or any extraordinary exertions in the way of fine writing. With my view of the subject I was persuaded, that numerous extracts would do more to establish my opinion, than the most laboured and finished disquisition; and, accordingly, I have hitherto confined myself to that plan, seldom troubling the reader with my own observations, and sometimes even passing by some of the conclusions, which the extracts suggested, from an opinion, that they could not well escape the observation of those, who read them with attention. The inquiry, in my opinion, required much detail rather than nice disquisition, or ingenious

speculation ; and seemed as forcibly to solicit simplicity of writing, as it did to reject the encumbering aid of unnecessary, and therefore of meretricious, decoration. But let us return to our proofs.

On the 24th of November, 1767, the King went to the House of Lords, and opened the session with the following speech.

“ My Lords and Gentlemen,

“ I have chosen to call you together at this season of the year, that my Parliament might have full deliberations upon all such branches of the public service, as may require their immediate attention ; without the necessity of continuing the session beyond the time most suitable to my people, for the election of a new parliament : and I doubt not, but you will be careful, from the same considerations, to avoid, in your proceedings, all unnecessary delay.

“ Nothing, in the present situation of affairs abroad, gives me reason to apprehend, that you will be prevented, by any interruption of the public tranquillity, from fixing your whole attention upon such points, as concern the internal welfare and prosperity of my people.

“ Among these objects of a domestic nature, none can demand a more speedy, or more serious attention, than what regards the high price of corn, which neither the salutary laws passed in the last session of parliament, nor the produce of the late harvest, have yet been able so far to reduce, as to give sufficient relief to the distresses of the poorer sort of my people. Your late residence in your several counties must have enabled you to judge, whether any further provisions can be made conducive to the attainment of so desirable an end.

“ Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

“ I will order the proper officers to lay before you the estimates for the service of the ensuing year. The experience I have had of your constant readiness to grant me all such supplies, as should be found necessary for the security, interest, and honour of the nation, (and I have no other to ask of you) renders it unnecessary for me to add any exhortations upon this head: and I doubt not but the same public considerations will induce you to persevere, with equal alacrity, in your endeavours to diminish the national debt; while, on my part, no care shall be wanting to contribute, as far as possible, to the attainment of that most essential object, by every frugal application of such supplies as you shall grant.

“ My Lords and Gentlemen,

“The necessity of improving the present general tranquillity to the great purpose of maintaining the strength, the reputation, and the prosperity of this country, ought to be ever before your eyes. *To render your deliberations for that purpose successful, endeavour to cultivate a spirit of harmony among yourselves.* My concurrence in whatever will promote the happiness of my people you may always depend upon; and, in that light, I shall ever be desirous of encouraging union among all those, who wish well to their country.”

After this speech had been read in the House of Commons, an address was moved and seconded, in the usual manner. Mr. Secretary Conway then stood up and supported the motion. He concluded his speech with a panegyric on the late Mr. Charles Townshend; and, having mentioned his talents, abilities, judgment, sagacity, &c. he said,—“ That his dear lamented friend had engaged himself to prepare a plan to be submitted to parliament, for the effectual relief of the poor in the article of provisions; and he had no question, that, if that great man had survived, he would have been able to perform his promise; but, unfortunately for the public, his



plan was lost with him : that it was easy to find a successor to his place, but impossible to find a successor to his abilities, or one equal to the execution of his plans. The house ought not, therefore, to be surprised, that the King's surviving servants had not yet been able to devise any scheme for the relief of the poor, although a man of Mr. Townshend's superior qualifications might have been fully equal to the task."

Mr. Burke then got up and spoke to the following purport.—“ Sir, The condition of this country, at the conclusion of the last spring, was such as gave us strong reason to expect, that not a single moment of the interval between that period and our winter meeting would be lost, or misemployed. We had a right to expect, that gentlemen, who thought themselves equal to advise about the government of the nation, would, during this period, have applied all their attention, and exerted all their efforts, to discover some effectual remedy for the national distress. For my own part, I had no doubt, that, when we again met, the administration would have been ready to lay before us some plan for a speedy relief of the people, founded upon such certain lights and informations, as they alone are able to procure, and digested with an accuracy propor-

tioned to the time they have had to consider of it: but, if these were our expectations, if these were the hopes conceived by the whole house, how grievously are we disappointed! After an interval of so many months, instead of being told, that a plan is formed, or that measures are taken, or at least, that materials have been diligently collected, upon which some scheme might be founded, for preserving us from famine; we see that this provident ministry, these careful providers, are of opinion, they have sufficiently acquitted themselves of their duty, by advising his Majesty to recommend the matter once more to our consideration, and so endeavouring to relieve themselves from the burthen and censure, which must fall somewhere, by throwing it upon parliament. God knows in what manner they have been employed for these four months past. It appears too plainly they have done but little good. I hope they have not been busied in doing mischief; and though they have neglected every useful, every necessary occupation, I hope their leisure has not been spent in spreading corruption through the people.

“ Sir, I readily assent to the laborious pænegyric, which the honourable gentleman upon the floor (Mr. Conway) has been pleased to make

on a very able member of the administration, whom we have lately lost, (Mr. Charles Townshend :) No man had a higher opinion of his talents than I had ; but as to his having conceived any plan for remedying the general distress about provisions, (as the gentleman would have us understand) I see many reasons for suspecting, that it could never have been the case. If that gentleman had formed such a plan, or if he had collected such materials as we are now told he had, I think it is impossible but that, in the course of so many months, some knowledge, or intimation, of it must have been communicated to the gentlemen who acted with him, and who were united with him, not less by friendship than by office. He was not a reserved man ; and surely, sir, his colleagues, who had every opportunity of hearing his sentiments in office, in private conversation, and in this house, must have been strangely inattentive to a man, whom they so much admired, or uncommonly dull, if they could not retain the smallest memory of his opinions on matters on which they ought naturally to have consulted him often. If he had even drawn the loosest outlines of a plan, is it conceivable, that all traces of it should be so soon extinguished ? To me, sir, such an absolute oblivion seems wholly incredible. Yet, admitting the fact for a moment,

what an humiliating confession is it for an administration, who have undertaken to advise about the conducting of an empire, to declare to this house, that, by the death of a single man, all projects for the public good are at an end, all plans are lost, and that this loss is irreparable, since there is not a leader surviving, who is, in any measure, capable of filling up the dreadful vacuum.

“ But I shall quit this subject for the present ; and, as we are to consider of an address in return to the speech from the throne, I beg leave to mention some observations occurring to me upon the speech itself, which, I think, I am warranted, by the established practice of this house, to treat merely as the speech of the minister.

“ The chief and only pretended merit of the speech is, that it contains no extraordinary matter, that it can do no harm, and, consequently, that an address of applause upon such a speech is but a mere compliment to the throne, from which no inconvenience can arise, nor consequence be drawn. Now, sir, supposing this to be a true representation of the speech, I cannot think it does the administration any great honour, nor

can I agree, that to applaud the throne for such a speech would be attended with no inconvenience. Although an address of applause may not enter into the approbation of particular measures, yet it must unavoidably convey a general acknowledgement at least, that things are, upon the whole, as they should be, and that we are satisfied with the representation of them, which we have received from the throne. But this, sir, I am sure, would be an acknowledgement inconsistent with truth, and inconsistent with our own interior conviction, unless we are contented to accept of whatever the ministry please to tell us, and wilfully shut our eyes to any other species of evidence.

“As to the harmlessness of the speech, I must, for my own part, regret the times, when speeches from the throne deserved another name, than that of innocent; when they contained some real and effectual information to this house, some express account of measures already taken, or some positive plan of future measures, for our consideration. Permit me, sir, to divide the present speech into three heads, and a very little attention will demonstrate, how far it is from aiming at that spirit of business and energy, which formerly animated the speeches from the

throne : you will see, under the division, that the small portion of matter contained in it is of such a nature, and so stated, as to preclude all possibility, or necessity of deliberation in this place. The first article is ‘ that every thing is quiet abroad.’ The truth of this assertion, when confirmed by an enquiry, which I hope this house will make into it, would give me the sincerest satisfaction ; for, certainly, there never was a time when the distress and confusion of the interior circumstances of this nation made it more absolutely necessary to be upon secure and peaceable terms with our neighbours : but I am a little inclined to suspect, and indeed it is an opinion too generally received, that this appearance of good understanding with our neighbours deserves the name of stagnation rather than of tranquillity ; that it is owing, not so much to the success of our negociations abroad, as to the absolute and entire suspension of them for a very considerable time. Consuls, envoys, and ambassadors, it is true, have been regularly appointed, but, instead of repairing to their stations, have, in the most scandalous manner, loitered at home : as if they had either no business to do, or were afraid of exposing themselves to the resentment, or derision of the court to which they were destined. Thus have all our nego-



tiations with Portugal been conducted, and thus they have been dropped. Thus hath the Manilla ransom, that once favourite theme, that perpetual echo with some gentlemen, been consigned to oblivion. The slightest remembrance of it must not now be revived. At this rate, sir, foreign powers may well permit us to be quiet; it would be equally useless and unreasonable in them to interrupt a tranquillity, which we submit to purchase upon such inglorious terms, or to quarrel with an humble, passive government, which hath neither spirit to assert a right, nor to resent an injury. In the distracted, broken, miserable state of our interior government, our enemies find a consolation and remedy for all that they suffered in the course of the war, and our councils amply revenge them for the successes of our arms.

“The second article of the speech contains ‘a recommendation of what concerns the dear-ness of corn to our immediate and earnest deliberation.’ No man, sir, is more ready than myself, as an individual, to show all possible deference to the respectable authority under which the speech from the throne is delivered; but, as a member of this house, it is my right, nay, I must think myself bound to consider it as

the advice of the minister; and, upon this principle, if I would understand it rightly, or even do justice to the text, I must carry the minister's comment along with me. But what, sir, has been the comment upon the recommendation made to us from the throne? Has it amounted to any more, than a positive assurance, that all the endeavours of administration to form a plan for relieving the poor in the article of provisions had proved ineffectual? That they neither have a plan, nor materials of sufficient information to lay before the house, and that the object itself is, in their apprehension, absolutely unattainable? If this be the fact, if it be really true, that the minister, at the same time that he advises the throne to recommend a matter to the earnest deliberation of parliament, confesses, in his comment, that this very matter is beyond the reach of this house, what inference must we necessarily draw from such a text, and such an illustration? I will not venture to determine what may be the real motive of this strange conduct and inconsistent language, but I will boldly pronounce, that it carries with it a most odious appearance. [“ It has too much the air of a design to exculpate the crown, and the servants of the crown, at the expence of parliament. The gracious recommendation in the speech will soon be known

all over the nation. The comment and true illustration added to it by one of the ministry will probably not go beyond the limits of these walls." (*It was not then allowed to report the speeches of members of parliament as it is at present.*) "What then must be the consequence? The hopes of the people will be raised. They of course will turn their eyes upon us, as if our endeavours alone were wanting to relieve them from misery and famine, and to restore them to happiness and plenty; and, at last, when all their golden expectations are disappointed; when they find, that, notwithstanding the earnest recommendation from the crown, parliament has taken no effectual measures for their relief, the whole weight of their resentment will naturally fall upon us their representatives. We need not doubt but the effects of their fury will be answerable to the cause of it. It will be proportioned to the high recommending authority, which we shall seem not to have regarded; and, when a monarch's voice cries havock, will not confusion, riot, and rebellion, make their rapid progress through the land? The unhappy people, groaning under the severest distress, deluded by vain hopes from the throne, and disappointed of relief from the legislature, will, in their despair, either set all law and order at defiance; or, if the law

be enforced upon them, it must be by the bloody assistance of a military hand. We have already had a melancholy experience of the use of such assistance. But even legal punishments lose all appearance of justice, when too strictly inflicted on men compelled by the last extremity of distress to incur them. We have been told, indeed, that, if the crown had taken no notice of the distress of the people, such an omission would have driven them to despair; but, I am sure, sir, that to take notice of it, in this manner, to acknowledge the evil and to declare it to be without remedy, is the most likely way to drive them to something beyond despair—to madness; and against whom will their madness be directed, but against us their innocent representatives?]

“ With respect to the third, and last head into which the speech may be divided, I readily agree, that there is a cause of discord somewhere: where it is I will not pretend to say. That it does exist is certain; and I much doubt, whether it is likely to be removed by any measures taken by the present administration. As to vague and general recommendations to us to maintain unanimity amongst us, I must say I think they are become, of late years, too flat and stale to bear being repeated. That such are the kind senti-

ments and wishes of our monarch I am far from doubting; but, when I consider it as the language of the minister, as a minister's recommendation, I cannot help thinking it a vain and idle parade of words without meaning. Is it in their own conduct that we are to look for an example of this boasted union? Shall we discover any trace of it in their broken, distracted councils, their public disagreements, and private animosities? Is it not notorious, that they subsist only by creating divisions among others? That their plan is to separate party from party? Friend from friend? Brother from brother? Is not their very motto *Divide et impera*? When such men advise us to unite, what opinion must we have of their sincerity? In the present instance, however, the speech is particularly farcical. When we are told, that affairs abroad are perfectly quiet, consequently, that it is unnecessary for us to take any notice of them; when we are told, that there is, indeed, a distress at home, but beyond the reach of this house to remedy; to have unanimity recommended to us in the same breath, is in my opinion, something lower than ridiculous. If the two first propositions be true, in the name of wonder, upon what are we to debate? Upon what is it possible for us to disagree? On one point our advice is not wanted:

on the other it is useless: but, it seems, it will be highly agreeable to the ministry to have us unite in approving of their conduct; and, if we have concord enough amongst ourselves, to keep in unison with them and their measures, I dare say, that all the purposes of administration, aimed at by the address, will be fully answered, and entirely to their satisfaction. But this is a sort of union, which I hope never will, which, I am satisfied, never can prevail in a free parliament like ours. While we are freemen we may disagree; but when we unite, on the terms recommended to us by the administration, we must be slaves."

After having now conducted the reader through the speech from the throne, and also through Mr. Burke's remarks upon it, and on Mr. Conway's commentary, it becomes necessary for me, in this stage of our inquiry, to state again, that the King's speech and that of Mr. Burke were both spoken on *the 24th of November, 1767*. Four or five days after, at the farthest, that is, on *the 28th or 29th of November*, Mr. Woodfall, the printer of the Public Advertiser, received a communication from his private correspondent C. (Junius), which led him, on the morning of Monday the 30th of November, 1767, to insert the following



notice to his correspondent : “ *C’s favour is come to hand, and we think our paper much honoured by his correspondence. He may be assured we shall take every possible means to deserve a continuance of it.*” This, the reader will observe, was a mere complimentary acknowledgement of the receipt of his correspondent’s communication. The next day, however, that is, on the first of December (1767) the following additional notice to his correspondent C. appeared in the *Public Advertiser* : “ *We most heartily wish to oblige our valuable correspondent C, but his last favour is of so delicate a nature, that we dare not insert it, unless we are permitted to make such changes in certain expressions, as may take off the immediate offence, without hurting the meaning.*”

After this notice nothing farther appeared in the *Public Advertiser*, relative to C’s communication, until Mr. Woodfall thought proper to give it to the public, four days after, that is, on the 5th of December, after he had sufficient time to procure the acquiescence of his correspondent in the changes and omissions which he thought it necessary to make in the communication, for his own safety. On the 5th of December we, accordingly, find the following letter in the *Public Advertiser*.

“ TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

“ Mr. Printer,

“ There are a party of us, who, for our amusement, have established a kind of political club. We mean to give no offence whatever to any body in our debates. The following is a mere *jeu d'esprit*, which I threw out at one of our late meetings, and it is at your service, if you think it will afford the least entertainment to your readers.

“ I am, &c.

“ Y. Z.”

The communication which Y. Z. (or C), in this short letter calls a mere *jeu d'esprit*, and which he asserts to have been spoken by himself at one of the late meetings of his political club, is nothing more or less, than the foregoing speech of Mr. Burke, which, it now appears, was sent to Mr. Woodfall by his private correspondent C\*, four or five days after Mr. Burke had spoken it in the House of Commons. If we compare the copy of the speech printed above, with that which appeared in the Public Advertiser, and which is now given in the second volume of the new edition of Junius, (from p. 499 to p. 509) we shall

\* The reader must bear in mind, that C. was the signature always used by Junius, in his private correspondence with Mr. Woodfall.

find, that they correspond word for word, and line for line, with the two following exceptions; first the substitution of such words as were necessary to keep up the opinion, that it was spoken, not in the House of Commons, but in a political club; such as the use of the words *committee*, *society*, *advice from the chair*, &c. &c. instead of *ministry*, *administration*, *House of Commons*, *speech from the throne*, &c. &c.; and, secondly, the omission of certain parts, which Mr. Woodfall, it seems, was afraid to publish, on account, as he thought, of their libellous tendency. He, however, placed asterisks \* \* \* where those omissions occurred: and, if the reader will compare the copy of the speech, given in the new edition of Junius, with that which is copied above, from the parliamentary debates, he will find, that the parts, left out by Mr. Woodfall, were certainly the most severe and pointed in the whole speech. These I have included within brackets, as may be seen by turning to pages 197, 8, 9, of this Inquiry.

That this speech was the communication, to which Mr. Woodfall alluded, in his notices to his correspondent C, on the 30th of Nov. and the 1st of Dec. must be evident, from the delay in its appearance for four days after, which gave Mr. Woodfall time to obtain leave from C. to

make the necessary changes; but more fully, and, indeed, incontrovertibly, from *the alterations and omissions*, with which it was at length printed in the *Public Advertiser*. Indeed the omission of the parts, to which I have already alluded, is quite sufficient to identify it with the communication referred to in Mr. Woodfall's notices to *C*. For it must be remembered, that it was, at that time, deemed a breach of privilege, and punishable accordingly, to publish a report of the speeches of any member of parliament; it being only in the year 1771, that the proprietors of newspapers were first allowed to publish, with the names of the speakers, the speeches of the members of either house of parliament. Before that time the members, who were anxious to have their speeches given to the public, generally sent copies of them, (as *C*. did in this instance) under fictitious names and designations, to some of the public journals. The danger too, it ought to be remembered, to which the printer knew he was exposing himself, must be deemed greater in the present instance, than in ordinary cases; for he was aware, that the communication touched upon a very delicate subject, and canvassed, not at all in measured language, but with the greatest freedom and boldness, every topic in the King's speech.

It will be also proper to state, that the above speech was unquestionably spoken by Mr. Burke on the 24th of Nov. 1767, and appears, accordingly, under his name, in the parliamentary debates of that time. In an edition of these debates, published five years after, (that is, in the year 1772) now lying before me, it is given in *an authentic form*, as his speech; that is, with inverted commas, as it was customary with the collectors and editors of the parliamentary debates to give such speeches (and such only) as they had from authority. I ought to add, that, whenever they had not the speeches from authority, they printed them merely from such fugitive reports, as they were able to collect, without any such accompanying marks of authenticity. It deserves to be remarked further, that this very speech was printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, for December, 1767, under this title—“*A curious speech spoken at the opening of a late sessions;*” a circumstance, which completely settles the point as to its authenticity. And, besides, it is certain, that it was never disclaimed by Mr. Burke, though he must have seen it attributed to him in that edition of the parliamentary debates, which was published by Almon in the year 1772, and in several other editions of these debates given afterwards to the public, during Mr. Burke's life-time.

I may be allowed to add, that M'Cormack considered it as authentic, for he has given extracts from this speech in his life of Mr. Burke.

From this short detail, therefore, it is clear, beyond all possibility of doubt, that this speech was spoken by Mr. Burke, on the 24th of Nov. 1767. It is equally clear, that it was sent, by his private correspondent *C.* (that is, *by Junius*) to Mr. Woodfall. It may be objected, that even allowing it to be Mr. Burke's speech, and also allowing it to have been sent to Mr. Woodfall by Junius, still that this does not identify Junius with Mr. Burke. Although this objection has certainly no weight with me, I thought it but fair to state it, for the satisfaction of my readers. That it is entitled to no serious consideration, will, I trust, be evident for the following reasons: First, *C.* in his letter to Mr. Woodfall, asserts the speech to be *his own*, (his words are, "*which I threw out at one of our late meetings*") ; which, supposing him to be merely the reporter of it, he, or indeed any other reporter, could not have the presumption of doing, at least without the author's consent. Nor, indeed, is it at all probable, that Mr. Burke would allow any reporter, however friendly, to send to a public journal, as his own, a speech spoken by Mr. Burke in the



hearing of the whole House of Commons, and which all those, who heard it spoken, must immediately recognize as Mr. Burke's speech, as soon as it was given to the public. Besides, from the anxiety, which we well know Mr. Burke felt, at a subsequent period, (I mean when regular reporters were allowed to go to the gallery of the House of Commons) to have his speeches correctly reported, we may be satisfied, how improbable it was, that he could wish another to have the credit of a speech, which he well knew must be so honourable to himself. I may add further on this point, lest any of my readers may still think it improbable that Mr. Burke would have submitted to the drudgery of reporting, or sending to the press, a copy of his own speech, that he has done so frequently, at a more advanced period of his life, when he was much more distinguished, than it was possible for him to be in 1767, both as a writer, a statesman, and an orator. I know it to be a fact, for I have it from the respectable editor of one of the most respectable of our public journals, that Mr. Burke frequently, after having made a speech in the House of Commons, came to his house, and wrote a report of it while they were taking their wine together. Is it at all probable, that the man, who was in the habit of imposing so laborious a

task upon himself\*, could be disposed to squander away upon others the honour, which, he must have very well known, his speeches were calculated to confer upon himself? Besides it is foolish, in the present instance, to say, that C, or Junius, only acted the part of a friendly reporter, in sending the speech of another to Mr. Woodfall, and calling it his own. For what possible advantage can we suppose him to have expected from telling the public, that he was the author of a speech, which he knew was another's, and which all the members of the House of Commons, at least, must have known to be Mr. Burke's? Is it not clear, that all those, who heard the speech in the House, would, when they saw the letter of Y. Z. in the Public Advertiser, in which he says it was spoken by himself, infer imme-

\* Burke, almost from the time of his arrival in London, was a constant writer in the public journals. "When he had entered himself of the Temple (says Bisset) he submitted to the drudgery of regularly writing for daily, weekly, and monthly publications." (Life of Burke, p. 24.) Bisset also informs us, after Mr. Burke's return from Ireland, whither he had accompanied Mr. Hamilton, that—"He still *occasionally* wrote political essays in periodical publications. The Public Advertiser was then the paper, in which men of literature and genius most frequently contributed their efforts. Burke's writings in that journal attracted the notice of that worthy nobleman, the Marquis of Rockingham, who remarked their uncommon ability, and sought the acquaintance of the author. He was introduced to the Marquis by Mr. Fitzherbert, father of Lord St. Helens." (Ibid. p. 52.)

diately, that the letter in question, as well as the speech which accompanied it, were sent to the printer by Mr. Burke himself? In the second place I may remark, as it is most likely, that Mr. Burke's speech was sent to Mr. Woodfall, not by a reporter, but by himself; so also, supposing it to have been sent by a mere reporter, that it is in the highest degree improbable, that Junius was that reporter, unless we, at the same time suppose, that Junius was the intimate friend of Mr. Burke. We know, that Junius, whoever he was, had stores enough within himself, and could not, at that time, be so much at a loss for subjects for political writing, as to be under the necessity of pirating the productions of others, and decking himself out in a plumage not his own. But, at all events, such were the undoubted talents of Junius, that no scholar of candour, or reputation, can for a moment think it possible, that he would demean himself so much, however highly he may be supposed to think of Mr. Burke's speech, as to say, for the mere purpose of imposing upon Mr. Woodfall, that it was his own. Can it be, at all, in the least degree probable, supposing them different persons, and unacquainted, that Junius would have condescended to become the reporter of Mr. Burke's speeches, when we know, that, in all his political

writings, he has scarcely taken any notice of Mr. Burke? This opinion is further confirmed, by the following extracts from his private letters to Mr. Woodfall, which show incontrovertibly, how indignant he was at finding, that some essays, written by others, were mistaken for his by the public. “As I do not choose to answer for any body’s sins but my own, I must desire you to say to-morrow—‘We can assure the public, that the letter signed A. B. relative to the Duke of Rutland, is not written by the author of Junius.’ I sometimes change my signature, but could have no reason to change the paper, especially for one that does not circulate half so much as yours.” (Private letters, N<sup>o</sup>. 13.) In a previous letter (No. 11) he requested Mr. Woodfall to reprint this letter signed A. B.; hinting at the same time, that it was not his own. “I should be much obliged to you, if you would reprint a letter in the London Evening Post of last night, to the Duke of Grafton. If it had not been anticipated, I should have touched upon the subject myself. However it is not ill-done, and it is very material, that it should spread.” On another occasion he addresses Mr. Woodfall as follows: “By your affected silence you encourage an idle opinion, that I am the author of the *Whig*, &c. though you very well know the con-

trary. I neither admire the writer, nor his idol. I hope you will soon set this matter right." (Private letters, No 23.)

If, however, after all, I should admit, which I certainly do not, that no more is proved by the preceding documents, than that Junius was merely the reporter of Mr. Burke's speech, it is pretty clear, that he must have been one of Mr. Burke's friends, when he would undertake such trouble for him, but more particularly from the circumstance of his saying, that the speech was *his own*; for can any scholar, for a moment, think it in the least degree probable, that Junius, to whom it could answer no purpose whatever of fame or of profit, would disgrace himself by assuming the merit of Mr. Burke's speech, without his consent? If any persons are *bona fide* credulous enough to believe this in any degree probable, I don't know, that it is possible to say any thing, by which they would be undeceived. At all events, when the conclusions suggested by these last documents are coupled with those arising from the numerous examples of similarity of style and coincidence of opinion, which the reader has already seen; but more particularly, when it is remembered, that the coincidence, as I have incontrovertibly shown, extends even to their

very faults and defects, I am persuaded, that the result of the whole, in every fair and candid mind, will be a full conviction, that the letters of Junius were written by Mr. Burke.

When I undertook to prove, that Mr. Burke was Junius, I was fully aware, though I was not literally disturbing a nest of hornets, that a publication like the present must expose me to considerable censure and odium. The enemies of Mr. Burke would not wish him to have the honour of being the author; and I know, from authentic sources, that his nearest relatives and friends, satisfied with the reputation which he had acquired by his acknowledged works, did not at all desire to see him invested with any additional literary honours, at least with any that had their origin in the present source. I was, besides, persuaded, that, even with respect to many, whomight be considered as neutral so far as Mr. Burke's claims were concerned, I was touching upon very tender ground, or rather disturbing cinders in which the remains of former heat were not as yet quite extinguished. From my own experience I knew, that the subject of Junius was a very delicate one; which, if I touched upon it at all, must be approached not with a trembling, but with a bold and decisive hand. A host of prejudices must be encountered, and if the attack was a



timorous, or a cautious one, they were not very likely to give way. The opinions, which most persons had formed on the subject, being different from my own, presented, on that account, more formidable obstacles to my undertaking: and though I was satisfied that most of these opinions were mere prejudices, being founded on no one single plausible reason whatever, I was still fully aware, that this served only to make them less tractable, and as they were cherished with no less partiality, that it was as dangerous to attempt to overturn them, as it would be the most sacred tenet of the owner's religious faith. What then was to be done? Was the truth not to be hazarded, or told, because it was likely to disturb deep-rooted prejudices, and to give offence to interested friends, as well as to malicious and bigotted enemies? This, I thought, would be a cowardly and an ungenerous proceeding. I, therefore, determined to give truth fair play, to whatever consequences it might lead. I was aware, that some of them must be disagreeable; but I knew also, that something must be hazarded in almost every exertion of public duty.

The writer of the Preliminary Essay in the new edition, after he has read the preceding details, will, I think, scarcely maintain, that Mr. Burke *could not write in the style of Junius*; or, if

he is determined to stick to that opinion, will, I am persuaded, have but few followers. From the peculiar advantages, which he certainly possessed, for forming a correct opinion on the subject, being in possession of various documents calculated to facilitate such an inquiry, it does not appear, at least, if we are to judge from his labours on the present occasion, that he is a person, who is at all likely to guide the public judgment in any thing that regards style. Acquainted as he ought to be, in order to give a good edition of Junius, with the political history and writings of the period, during which that author wrote in the *Public Advertiser*, it is not a little strange, that he should be ignorant, that the speech, which he gives us as one of the communications of Junius, was in reality the speech of Mr. Burke. When so important a fact could escape his notice, we cannot be surprised, if we find him wrong in other particulars, or reasoning feebly or erroneously with regard to the claims of Mr. Burke.

The other proofs, (few of them deserve the name) on which he relies to show, that Mr. Burke was not Junius, have indeed little weight. Mr. Burke "could not have consented (he thinks) to disparage his own talents in the manner, in which

Junius has disparaged them” in the following passage: “I willingly accept of a sarcasm from Colonel Barré, or *a simile from Mr. Burke.*” For my part, I am really at a loss to see any thing at all so very disparaging, as this writer supposes, in the passage in question. But supposing it, for a moment, to be fully as disparaging as he could wish, could he see no good reason for its use? Was he not aware of the purpose, which it was calculated to answer, on the supposition, that Mr. Burke was Junius? Or, at all events, ought he not to have remembered, how pointedly this same Junius retorted the raillery, which was thrown upon the shabby black coat of Mr. Burke, by one of his own opponents; or, if this could not satisfy him, did he forget, that this very Junius, at no time a spendthrift of his praise, had furnished an antidote to his own poison, in the following passage, in one of his letters to Mr. Wilkes; so that, if his left-hand inflicted a wound, his right was immediately ready to apply the balm? “If you mean, that the Americans should be authorised to send their representatives to the British parliament, *I shall be contented with referring you to what Mr. Burke has said upon this subject, and will not venture to add any thing of my own, for fear of discovering an offensive disregard of your opinion.*” (Vol. i. p.\* 293.) The

praise contained in this passage, to say the least of it, is to the full as flattering, as the other was disparaging or mortifying.

But, although it has escaped the notice of the New Editor, I can see very clearly, that the passage in question, supposing Mr. Burke to be the author, was well calculated to lay suspicion, and to promote one object, of which Junius never lost sight, and upon which he seems to have been all along as intent, as upon any other, his own personal concealment. Junius knew, that Mr. Burke was more suspected than any body else, for being the writer of the letters; and, if we suppose him to be the real author, a slighting reflection upon himself from the pen of Junius, Burke was well aware, would be one of the most effectual modes, at that time, for discountenancing such an opinion. It was the interest of Junius, as well as his most anxious desire, that his concealment should be as impenetrable as possible. It was well calculated for carrying on the war, which he waged, in the best and most expeditious manner, and to ensure, what must be still dearer to him, his own personal security\*. A discovery of the writer would frustrate the great objects he had in

\* See Junius, vol. i. p.\*314.

view in the publication of his letters, and expose him, besides, to much enmity, perhaps to unavoidable danger. In such circumstances, therefore, it would be in the highest degree prudent in Mr. Burke, if he was Junius, when he knew, that he was so strongly suspected, to talk more slightly of himself even than Junius did in the passage in question. Knowing, that he was anxiously and incessantly pursued, he must be aware, that to make any reflection upon himself was, in effect, to start new game, which would either divert the course of the hunters by crossing the original scent, or, by thus making it more difficult to trace it, give it time to cool, which would check the rapidity of their progress, and ultimately break up the pursuit.

It is worthy of remark, that the compliment paid to Burke, in the letter to Mr. Wilkes, was written one month sooner than the letter, which contains the slighting reflection upon him. The letter to Mr. Wilkes, containing the former, was dated on the 7th of September, 1771, whilst the letter in the Public Advertiser, in which the latter occurs, is dated on the 5th of October the same year. It is also worthy of remark, that both these are the only instances in which Junius takes any notice of Mr. Burke; and, as he

complimented him in the first instance, it is but fair to suppose, that Junius was well affected towards him. But what could be his reason for so suddenly altering his opinion, as to pass to censure from panegyric, in the short space of twenty-eight days? In his public letters we can find no motive, or inducement ; but, if I am not much deceived, we shall be able to account satisfactorily for this change, if we examine his private letters to Mr. Woodfall and Mr. Wilkes.

That Junius was very anxious to conceal himself, and exceedingly alarmed at any attempts which were made to penetrate his secret, will appear from the following extracts. When Sir William Draper challenges him to produce his person, he tells him—"As to me, it is by no means necessary, that I should be exposed to the resentment of the worst and most powerful men in this country, though I may be indifferent about yours. *Though you would fight, there are others, who would assassinate.*" (Sept. 25, 1769.) In his first private letter to Mr. Woodfall, he says—"If any inquiry is made about these papers, I shall rely on your giving me a hint." (April 20, 1769.) "I have received the favour of your note. From the contents of it, I imagine you may have something to communicate to me ; if that be the case, I beg you will be particular ;



and also, that you will tell me candidly, whether you know, or suspect who I am." (July 15, 1769.) In another private letter of the 21st of the same month, he says—"That Swinney is a wretched, but a dangerous fool. He had the impudence to go to Lord George Sackville, whom he had never spoken to, and to ask him whether, or no, he was the author of Junius. *Take care of him.*" On the 15th of September the same year, he writes to his correspondent: "As to me be assured, that it is not in the nature of things, that they, or you, or any body else should ever know me, unless I make myself known. All arts, or inquiries, or rewards, would be equally ineffectual." Again, (Nov. 12, 1769) "I return you the letters you sent me yesterday. A man who can neither write common English, nor spell, is hardly worth attending to. *It is probably a trap for me.* I should be glad, however, to know what the fool means. \*\*\* Instead of *C.*, in the usual place, say only *a Letter*, when you have occasion to write to me again. I shall understand you." On the 26th of December he tells Mr. Woodfall—"I doubt much, whether I shall ever have the pleasure of knowing you; but if things take the turn I expect, you shall know me by my works." "You must not (says he on the 12th of Jan. 1770) write to me again, but be assured I will never desert you. I received your letters regularly,

but it was impossible to answer them sooner." In the beginning of February he addresses him thus: "When you consider to what excessive enmities I may be exposed, you will not wonder at my caution. I really have not known how to procure your last." We find the following letter under the date of the 2d of Jan. 1771: "I have received your mysterious epistle. I dare say a letter may safely be left at the same place; but you may change the direction to Mr. John Tretley. You need not advertise it." "Our correspondence (says he again on the 11th of Feb. 1771) is attended with difficulties, yet I should be glad to see the paper you mention. Let it be left tomorrow, *without further notice*." And, on the 21st of the same month—"It will be very difficult, if not impracticable, for me to get your note." "I have not been able to get yours from that place, but you shall hear from me soon." (Sept. 25, 1771.) From all these extracts it is clear, that Junius laboured under great difficulties, in his correspondence with Mr. Woodfall, and that he was under a continual apprehension of being discovered. There was no period, however, at which he was more alarmed than towards the end of the year 1771. This will be made evident by the following extracts. I find these words in a letter addressed to Mr. Wilkes on the

7th of Sept. 1771. "As Junius, I can never expect to be rewarded. The secret is too important to be committed to any great man's discretion. If views of interest or ambition could tempt me to betray my own secret, how could I flatter myself, that the man I trusted would not act upon the same principles, and sacrifice me at once to the King's curiosity and resentment?" "When you send to me, (says he to Mr. Woodfall on the 11th of Nov. 1771) instead of the usual signal, say, *Vindex shall be considered, and keep the alteration a secret to every body.*" And on the 17th of December—"Upon no account, nor for any reason whatsoever, are you to write to me, until I give you notice."

There seems to have been no person, at whose attempts to discover him he was more alarmed, than at those of Mr. Garrick towards the conclusion of the year 1771. Garrick, it appears, took great pains for that purpose, and Junius, being aware of it, was constantly cautioning Mr. Woodfall to be on his guard against him. His private letters on these occasions betray his fears of being discovered more strongly, than at any other period. "Shew the Dedication and Preface (said he on the 8th of Nov. 1771) to Mr. Wilkes, and, if he has any *material* objection, let

me know. I say *material*, because of the difficulty of getting your letter." "Beware of David Garrick, he was sent to pump you, and went directly to Richmond to tell the King I should write no more." Two days after he wrote again to Mr. Woodfall on the same subject, inclosing the following letter.

" TO MR. DAVID GARRICK.

Nov. 10, 1771.

" I am very exactly informed of your impertinent inquiries and of the information you so busily sent to Richmond, and with what triumph and exultation it was received. I knew every particular of it the next day. Now mark me, vagabond: keep to your pantomimes, or be assured you shall hear of it. Meddle no more, thou busy informer! It is in *my* power to make you curse the hour, in which you dared to interfere with

" *Junius.*"

To Mr. Woodfall he says:—" I would send the above to Garrick directly, but that I would avoid having this hand too commonly seen. Oblige me, then, so much as to have it copied in any hand, and sent by the penny-post, that is if

you dislike sending it in your own writing. *I must be more cautious than ever. I am sure I should not survive a discovery three days ; or, if I did, they would attain me by bill. Change to the Somerset Coffee-house, and let no mortal know the alteration. I am persuaded you are too honest a man to contribute in any way to my destruction. Act honourably by me, and at a proper time you shall know me.*" In a few days after he writes thus :—" I have no doubt of what you say about David Garrick, so drop the note. The truth is, that, in order to curry favour, he made himself a greater rascal than he was. Depend upon what I tell you :—the King understood, that he had found out the secret by his own cunning and activity. *As it is important to deter him from meddling, I desire you will tell him, that I am aware of his practices, and will certainly be revenged if he does not desist. An appeal to the public from JUNIUS would destroy him.*" " Upon reflection I think it absolutely necessary to send that note to D. G. only say *practices* instead of *impertinent inquiries*. " I think you have no measures to keep with a man, who could betray a confidential letter, for so base a purpose, as pleasing \*\*\*\*\*." On the 27th of the same month he remarks again :—" Though we may not be deficient in point of capacity, it is very possible,

that neither of us may be cunning enough for Mr. Garrick." And at the end of the same letter :—" David Garrick has literally forced me to break my resolution of writing no more." " The London Packet (says he on the 17th of Dec. 1771) is not worth our notice. I suspect Garrick, and I would have you hint so to him."

From all these extracts it is manifest, that Junius was at all times apprehensive of being discovered, but more particularly so; through the exertions of Garrick, about the end of the year 1771. Mr. Burke, we know, lived on the most intimate terms with Garrick, and must have been well acquainted with his anxiety and exertions to discover the author of Junius. If, therefore, we couple these considerations with the fact, that Junius, in less than a month after he had complimented him, threw out, without any apparent reason, or necessity for it, a slighting observation upon Mr. Burke, remembering, at the same time, that it was done, at a period, during which, we know, that Junius was particularly afraid of a discovery, and alarmed for his own safety, it will, I am persuaded, afford a very strong presumptive proof of the identity of Junius and Mr. Burke. At a time when he was so much afraid of being detected, such a slighting remark



upon himself, was an excellent contrivance for checking the strong current of public suspicion, and for diverting it, out of the line of its former course, into a new channel.

It being clear, therefore, that concealment was all along a main object with Junius, and more particularly so about the time when he reflected on Mr. Burke, it is obvious, that the latter, supposing him to be the author, and smarting under the fear of detection, would readily have flung the reflection in question, or, indeed, one much severer, upon himself, to secure its attainment. The remark, therefore, of the new editor, that Mr. Burke “could not have consented to have disparaged,” [to disparage] “his own talents, in the manner, in which Junius has disparaged them”—in the passage in question, has no weight as an argument, and is, therefore, entitled to no consideration.

The next argument of the gentleman, who asserts positively, that “Burke could not have written in the style of Junius, which was precisely the reverse of his own”—is, that he denied his being the author “expressly and satisfactorily to Sir William Draper, who purposely interrogated him upon the subject.” When one

hears such folly as this brought forward as an argument upon the present subject, it is difficult to avoid laughing. Junius, in his public letters, told Sir William Draper, that he should never know him, not that he concealed himself from any apprehension of the effects of Sir William's resentment. If Burke was the author, is it at all probable, that he would be afterwards induced to give the lie to his own former declaration, and to become the trumpeter of his own secret (a secret which Junius was so anxious to preserve) for no other purpose, but to gratify the impertinent curiosity of Sir William Draper? I call it an impertinent curiosity, because it is obvious, that no man, attacked as Sir William was by Junius, had a right to put the question to any gentleman; as it was in effect to say:—"confess, that you have, without cause or provocation, wantonly attacked my character, and maliciously stabbed me in the dark. I want you to declare, that you have been to me a bitter enemy, and then I shall be able to punish you as I think fit, and fully to gratify my resentment." If Sir William, therefore, was to put the question to the real author, whether Mr. Burke was Junius or not, it is clear, that *he*, at least, could not reasonably expect to be answered in the affirmative: and, if the new editor is sanguine enough

to hope, that he should, I think I may safely affirm, that few of those, who read the private letters of Junius, will join in his expectation. For my part, when I consider the constant anxiety under which Junius laboured through fear of detection, so far am I from thinking the denial of Mr. Burke satisfactory, or, indeed, that of any man whom I could suspect to be the author, that I should be rather disposed to draw a very different inference from it, and to say (in the words of Junius) to my present opponent, or to any person so interested as Sir William Draper was, who could put such a question as his, and expect an answer in the affirmative,—“how can you reconcile such gross folly with an understanding so full of artifice as mine?” Is it possible, that any man possessing a clear and impartial judgment, after considering the extracts made in the preceding pages from his private letters, shewing, that the most anxious desire of his soul was concealment, can for a moment suppose, that Junius, whoever he was, would become the betrayer of his own secret? Is it not rather manifest, when his fears of detection were so great, that his answer to any person, who should take the liberty of *interrogating him purposely on the subject*, as Mr. Burke was interrogated by Sir William Draper, would be

decidedly in the negative. Mr. Burke's denying, therefore, that he was the author, when all the circumstances are considered, particularly the imminent peril, which a discovery would bring upon his fortune and his life, will not pass for a proof of the least weight with any mind that considers the point, with candour and impartiality.

As the argument, which I have been controverting, has had some countenance from the opinion of Dr. Johnson, as recorded by Boswell, it will be proper to notice that opinion here. Many of Burke's friends, among the rest Johnson, supposed him to be the author of Junius, as being the only man, whom they knew capable of the performance. "I should (said he) have believed Burke to be Junius, because I know no man but Burke, who is capable of writing these letters; but Burke spontaneously denied it to me: The case would have been different, had I asked him if he was the author. A man may think he has a right to deny it, when so questioned, as to an anonymous publication." And most undoubtedly so he has; for, were it not allowable for an author to deny it, when so questioned, without any violation of truth, it could serve no purpose to make the publication anony-

mous in the first instance, and would therefore be foolish, as it would be in the power of any inquisitive, or impertinent person, to extort the author's secret from him and give it to the public. And, in truth, were this not allowable, without being deemed a direct breach of veracity, the bad consequences would reach even farther; as it would not be in any man's power, if directly questioned, to keep any secret whatever, however delicate or important.

Johnson's inference from Burke's spontaneous denial, when all the circumstances brought to light by the publication of the private correspondence of Junius are considered, is neither conclusive or satisfactory. Burke knowing, that he was suspected more than any body else, may, if he was the author, deny it even spontaneously to Johnson; and very naturally too, when we consider the fears of Junius. He knew himself to be suspected by his friend, and was aware, if Johnson often declared that suspicion in conversation, that his authority would give it a more accredited and general currency. To deny it, therefore, spontaneously to the Doctor, was a good way to alter his opinion, and was well calculated to set suspicion (a great object with Junius) at rest. It was an artful way of coming upon

his friend unawares, and in an unsuspecting moment, and served to convert him from an instrument of discovery into a cloak for concealment. I shall conclude this point by citing the opinion of Bisset, who agrees with me on the subject. "Even spontaneous disavowal of a performance, by many imputed to him, and of which the supposition of his being the writer might have exposed him to prosecution, is not disproof." Junius himself was of opinion, that a discovery would expose him not merely to a prosecution, but to the resentment of the worst and most powerful men in the kingdom, and also to attainder and assassination. Would not Burke, would not any writer, from motives of personal security, and to avoid such consequences, even spontaneously deny such a performance? That Junius would readily do so is obvious even from his public letters, but more fully and incontrovertibly from those passages, which I have extracted from his private correspondence. The spontaneous denial of Burke to Johnson, is, therefore, of no more weight than his disavowal of the letters to Sir William Draper.

But my opponent has a new argument ready, which he brings forward as an auxiliary, by saying, that the truth of Mr. Burke's denial to Sir



William Draper, “is, moreover corroborated by the testimony of the late Mr. Woodfall, *who repeatedly declared*, that neither of them (Burke, or Mr. Hamilton) were the writers (was the writer) of these compositions.” This argument, in the hands of the new editor is, if possible, still more feeble than either of the preceding, for he has contrived, by his inconsistency, to strip it of whatever plausibility it might otherwise possess. The matter, in a few words, amounts only to this: Either Mr. Woodfall knew directly and positively, who Junius was, or his knowledge on this point was confined to suspicions and conjectures. In the former case his declaration would be decisive; but, in the latter, not of more weight, than that of any other person, unless he supported it by better facts, and by reasons more plausible, or better founded. That he did not know directly, who Junius was, at the time this writer ceased to correspond with him (that is, on the 19th of January, 1773) is clear from the private letters; nor have we any reason to suppose, that Junius ever revealed himself to him. Indeed, were there any doubt on this point, it is wholly removed by the Editor himself, who, after bringing in, at page 101 of the Preliminary Essay, Mr. Woodfall’s repeated declarations, as a make-weight in his argument, or rather wholly to turn

the balance, tells us, with all simplicity imaginable, in the 150th page of the same essay, that Mr. Woodfall admitted, *that he was not absolutely certain who was the author of the Letters*\*. Thus then, from his own admission, it is clear, that Mr. Woodfall knew no more about the author, than any body else, though, no doubt, he had his suspicions and conjectures. What these were, or upon what foundations they rested, is not once even hinted at in the new edition; so that it is not in our power to ascertain, whether they were well or ill-founded. But, at all events, as Mr. Woodfall did not know absolutely, who the author was, it is clear, that his negative declaration proves nothing in the present argument.

Another argument, with which we are favoured on this point, by the new Editor, is, “that Mr. Burke, in correcting his manuscripts for the press, and revising them in their passage through it, was notorious for the numerous alterations he was perpetually making, whilst the copy, with which the late Mr. Woodfall was furnished by Junius, for the genuine edition of his Letters, contained very few amendments of any kind.” One

\* The same admission is made at pp. 54-5, and 153 of the same essay.

would be apt to imagine, from the use of the word *manuscripts* in the beginning of this passage, that Junius furnished Mr. Woodfall with a manuscript copy of the whole of the letters for the genuine edition, containing very few amendments. This, however, was, by no means, the case. He sent him *the preface and dedication only* in manuscript; and, for the remainder of the work, contented himself with a printed copy of the letters, adding some corrections and notes in the margin, and at the bottom of the pages. The manuscript copy of the Preface and Dedication, is, indeed, beautifully written, and with few amendments. But could it not occur to the Editor, before he used such a feeble argument as the present, that the difficulties under which Junius laboured in corresponding with Mr. Woodfall were so great, that it would be almost impossible for him to have papers constantly passing backwards and forwards between them, without being frequently exposed to detection? To avoid this therefore, a man of less cunning than Junius must be aware, that his best plan was to make his manuscripts, in the first instance, as correct as possible. We find them, accordingly, though evidently in a disguised hand, very correctly and legibly written, so that it was not to be expected, that the printer would leave

many errors of the press, or make it necessary for the author to revise all the proofs himself. But, surely Mr. Burke never shewed greater anxiety to have his works correctly printed, than Junius does in his private letters to Mr. Woodfall; so that if we are at all to draw an argument from this source, it will be strongly in favour of the identity of both these writers. If Mr. Burke took great pains in correcting and altering his manuscripts and proofs, as we know he did, we have it upon record, though the Editor must have forgotten it when he used the preceding argument, that the works of Junius were equally laboured. “*Is there (says he) no labour in the composition of these letters?*” Mr. Horne, I fear, is partial to me, *and measures the facility of my writings, by the fluency of his own.*” The following extracts are from his private letters to Mr. Woodfall:—“ I wish the inclosed to be announced to-morrow conspicuously for Tuesday. *I am not capable of writing any thing more finished.*” “ I am now meditating *a capital*, and, I hope, a final piece; you shall hear of it shortly.” “ *I am strangely partial to the inclosed; it is finished with the utmost care. If I find myself mistaken in my judgment of this paper, I positively will never write again.*” “ At last I have concluded my great work, and, I assure you, *with*

*no small labour.*" These extracts are sufficient to prove, that he took great pains in the composition of his Letters. The following will show, that his manuscripts underwent many corrections and alterations, after which it was his rule to have a fair copy made out for the printer. Speaking of one of his letters, he says, to Mr. Woodfall—" You shall have it some time to-morrow night. *It cannot be corrected and copied sooner. I mean to make it worth printing.*" " The inclosed, though begun within these few days, *has been greatly laboured. It is very correctly copied, and I beg you will take care, that it be literally printed as it stands.*" It was impossible for Mr. Burke, or indeed for any man, to show more anxiety about having his works correctly printed, or to manifest a greater aversion to errata, than Junius does in his private letters. This will be evident from the following extracts. " I wish it were possible for you to print the inclosed to-morrow. Observe the italics *strictly* where they are marked." " The paper is extremely well printed, and has a good effect." " For *material* affection, for God's sake, read *maternal*; it is in the sixth paragraph. The rest is excellently done." " Your correction was perfectly right, the sense required it, and I am much obliged to you. When I spoke of *innumerable*

blunders, I meant Newberry's pamphlet ; for I must confess, that, upon the whole, your papers are very correctly printed." " Mr. Newberry having thought proper to reprint my Letters, I wish, at least, he had done it correctly. You will oblige me by giving him the following hint to-morrow." " Mr. Newberry having thought proper to reprint Junius's Letters, might, at least, have corrected the errata." After this follows a list of errata, to which he subjoins to Mr. Woodfall—" I did not expect more than the life of a newspaper ; but if this man will keep me alive, let me live without being offensive." " Pray make an erratum for *ultimate* in the paragraph about the Duke of Grafton ; it should be *intimate*. The rest is very correct." So minute was the attention of Junius as to the correctness and neatness of his works, that he lectures his correspondent sometimes even upon the size of his types. " I am convinced that the book will sell, and I suppose, will make two volumes. *The type might be one size larger than Wheble's.* But of all this you are the best judge." " The paper and type should, at least, be as good as Wheble's. You must correct the press your self ; but I should be glad to see corrected proofs of the two first sheets. Shew the *Dedication* and *Preface* to Mr. Wilkes, and, if he has any *mate-*



rial objection, let me know. I say *material*, because of *the difficulty of getting your letter*.”

“ I think the second page, with the widest lines, looks best. What is your essential reason for the change? I send you some more sheets. I think the paper is not so good as Wheble’s, but I may be mistaken—The type is good.” “ In page 25, it should be *the* instead of *your*. This is a *woeful mistake*. *Pray take care for the future*. Keep a page for errata.” “ You must then take care of it yourself, except that I must see proof sheets of the Dedication and Preface.”

“ It is essential, that I should have a proof sheet and correct it myself.” “ Your failing to send me the proofs, as you engaged to do, *disappoints and distresses me extremely*. It is not merely to correct the press, (*though even that is of consequence*), but for another most material purpose. This will be entirely defeated, if you do not let me have the two proofs on Monday morning.”

“ I return you the proof, with the errata, which you will be so good as *to correct carefully*. I have the greatest reason to be pleased with your care and attention.” “ In the Preface, page 20, line 7, read *unseasonable*. Page 26, line 18, read *accuracy*.” His care extends even to the proper placing of a note of admiration. “ There is no occasion for a mark of admiration at the

end of the motto. But it is of no moment whatsoever." The following is the last extract which I shall make on this subject :—" I have no view but to serve you, and consequently, have only to desire, that the Dedication and Preface may be correct. *Look to it. If you take it upon yourself, I will not forgive your suffering it to be spoiled. I weigh every word ; and every alteration, in my eyes at least, is a blemish.*"

Such were the minute attention and editorial cares of Junius : and such was the man, who, it is expected, we should believe, took less trouble in correcting his manuscripts for the press, and who was less anxious about the revision of proofs, or to have his works correctly printed, than Mr. Burke. For my part I do not believe, that there is an instance upon record of a greater anxiety in all these respects, than that which is manifested in the preceding extracts. Mr. Burke's anxiety in the same way is so well known, as to be almost proverbial ; so that, instead of being an argument against him, it would be difficult to select a topic better fitted to identify him with Junius.

Those who remember how eagerly Mr. Burke desired, that his *Reflections on the French Revo-*

*lution* should be published on a certain day, and how great were his mortification and disappointment, when it could not be effected, will find in it an additional circumstance to identify him with Junius, who was equally solicitous about the publication of the first edition of his Letters by Mr. Woodfall, before the meeting of Parliament. This will appear satisfactorily in the following passages. He wished the work to appear in the second week of January, 1772, and, being disappointed in this, says to his correspondent, on the 18th of that month:—"I am truly concerned to see, that the publication of the book is so long delayed. It ought to have appeared before the meeting of Parliament \*. By no means would I have you insert this long letter, if it made more than the difference of two days in the publication. Believe me, the delay is a real injury to the cause." On the 25th he says: "I am impatient for the book." And on the 10th of February: "The delay of the book spoils every thing." Again, on the seventeenth of the same month: "Surely you have misjudged it very much about the book. I could not have conceived it possible, that you could protract the publication so long. At this time,

\* It was for the same reason that Mr. Burke was so anxious about the publication of his *Reflections on the French Revolution*.

particularly before Mr. Sawbridge's motion, it would have been of singular use. You have trifled too long with the public expectation. At a certain point of time the appetite palls. I fear you have already lost the season. The book, I am sure, will lose the greatest part of the effect I expected from it. But I have done." He writes to him again, on the 22d, and concludes his letter thus: "All I can now say is, make haste with the book." "I am glad (says he again on the 29th), that the book will be out before Sawbridge's motion." And, on the 3d of March—"I was impatient to see the book, and think I had a right to that attention a little before the general publication."

Another proof, adduced by the author of the Preliminary Essay, to show, that Mr. Burke was not Junius, is drawn from the prosecution for a libel, instituted in 1783 against Mr. Woodfall by Mr. Burke, on account of some paragraphs in the Public Advertiser. Considerable interest, he tells us, had been made with Mr. Burke, to induce him to drop this prosecution in different stages of its progress, but to no purpose. Mr. Woodfall was found guilty, and obliged to pay £100. damages to the prosecutor. Our author thinks it morally impossible, that

Junius could have acted in this manner. My notion of moral impossibility is not quite so refined as that of this writer. So far am I from thinking it impossible, that such a proceeding on the part of Junius does not strike me even as improbable. The articles in the *Public Advertiser*, which gave rise to the prosecution, were certainly libellous, and calculated to bring considerable odium upon Mr. Burke and his family. His prosecution of Mr. Woodfall is not a proof, that he was very hostilely disposed towards him. But he had no other way of setting himself right with the public, or of punishing the author, but through the printer. Might he not also suspect, that the author of the libel, in case the printer was found guilty, would probably indemnify Mr. Woodfall for the damages and the expences of the suit? Or, putting even this consideration out of the question, would it not occur to him, that the exclusive copy-right of the *Letters of Junius*, and the profits arising from it, which even before that time must have been considerable, were a sufficient recompence for all Mr. Woodfall's trouble and expences? It is, besides, worthy of remark, that such a prosecution, if it was conducted, as this author tells us, with the utmost acrimony, was calculated to discountenance, at the time, the opinion, that he was the

author of the Letters, which, it is well known, that Mr. Burke was at considerable pains to effect. Of all the persons, to whom the Letters have been attributed, he alone betrayed manifest uneasiness and displeasure, when any body hinted, that he was the author; not, surely, because he was of opinion, that the composition and undoubted merit of the letters could be any disgrace to him. Upon one occasion it is known, that he left an agreeable party shortly after a hint thrown out by one of the company, who was an acquaintance of his, that he was the author, and, that he never spoke to that gentleman afterwards. Why should Mr. Burke be at such pains to deny, that he was the author, if he was not afraid, that it was possible to bring these compositions home to him? In this respect he corresponds more than any other of the persons suspected with Junius, whose vigilance, and exertions to conceal himself, and fear of detection were active, incessant, and extreme. Other suppositions and remarks relative to this prosecution, all equally remote from the conclusion of our author, may be made here; but it is needless to prosecute the subject farther.

“ If, however, (says our author) there should be readers *so inflexible* as still to believe, that



Mr. Burke was the real writer of Junius, and that his denial of the fact to Sir William Draper was only wrung from him under the influence of fear, it will be sufficient to satisfy even such readers, by shewing (to shew) *that the system of the politics of one was in direct opposition to that of the other, upon a variety of the most important points.* Burke was a decided partizan of Lord Rockingham, and continued so during the whole of that nobleman's life: Junius, on the contrary, *was as decided a friend to Mr. George Grenville.* Each was an antagonist to the other upon the great subject of the American Stamp Act. Junius was a warm and powerful advocate for triennial parliaments; Burke an inveterate enemy to them." This passage, objectionable as it is on many accounts, contains, however, the only strong and plausible objections, that have ever been urged to shew, that the works of Junius were not written by Mr. Burke. And though I am fully disposed to admit their force, I hope it will not be deemed great obstinacy in me, if I should be still *so inflexible* as to think, that Mr. Burke was, after all, the author of Junius. Most of my readers, I think, will be disposed to agree with me, that I have proved an affirmative, as well, at least, as my opponent has proved a negative; many of them, perhaps, that I have

proved it much better. It is necessary for me, however, to say something in reply to his present arguments.

Is it then true, that the systems of politics maintained by both writers were in direct opposition to one another *on a variety of the most important points*? If this be so, then, I must say, that many of the best politicians and scholars in this country have been a long time in error. I will also admit, that I, who do not at all pretend to be either a good scholar, or a good politician, have been also mistaken, though in very respectable company. Since ever I thought at all, or read any thing upon this subject, so far was I from suspecting, or being informed, that their systems of politics were different, that I understood, that the same doctrines, with one or two exceptions at the most, were maintained in the writings of Junius, and in the speeches and tracts of Mr. Burke. Junius, in the Public Advertiser, and Mr. Burke in the House of Commons, I always considered as the most able supporters of the Whig interest under Lord Rockingham; and I suspect, that, in this opinion, I have had the well-informed part of the nation on my side. But no, says our author, “Burke was the decided partizan of Lord Rock-

ingham, and Junius, on the contrary, was as decided a friend to Mr. George Grenville." Is it then true, that Junius was as decided an advocate for the measures of Mr. Grenville, as Burke was for those of Lord Rockingham? If this was the case, how did it happen, that Burke, during their appearance, was almost universally suspected, and even by those who had the best sources of information, to be the author of the Letters? How did it happen, that Mr. Horne, no bad judge one would suppose in such a case, accused Junius of being the partizan, not of Mr. Grenville, but of Lord Chatham? How did it happen, that Junius was not attacked by his opponents, as the friend of Mr. Grenville, or as the advocate of his political measures? Or, if it be true, with what truth, or consistency could Junius, in the very face of his enemies, and with all his letters before them and the public, make a boast of his independence, and assert, as he did with truth, that he was the decided, or exclusive advocate of no party whatsoever? "To write for profit, (said he) without taxing the press; to write for fame, and to be unknown; *to support the intrigues of faction, and to be disowned, as a dangerous auxiliary, by every party in the kingdom*, are contradictions which the ministers must reconcile, before I forfeit my credit with the

public." The court party, and the patriots, he says, would be equally unwilling to receive him. "But, in truth, sir, I have left no room for an accommodation with the piety of St. James's. My offences are not to be redeemed by recantation, or repentance. On one side, *our warmest patriots would disclaim me, as a burthen to their honest ambition.* On the other, the vilest prostitution, if Junius could descend to it, would lose its natural merit and influence in the cabinet, and treachery be no longer a recommendation to the Royal favour."

The present, I believe, is the first time, in which it has been gravely maintained, that Junius (in spite of his own declaration to the contrary, affirming, that he was of no party), was the advocate and partizan of Mr. Grenville. That he had a high respect for his abilities, character, and integrity, is clear from various parts of his writings; but it is equally manifest, that Junius was in direct hostility to some of the measures of Mr. Grenville's administration. For instance, did Junius approve of the proceedings against Mr. Wilkes, which commenced while Mr. Grenville was minister, and by his advice? Did he approve of the seizure of his papers, or of his arrest by a general warrant? Or did Ju-

nus approve of another doctrine, not only maintained, but carried into execution during that administration, that the crown, during a recess, had the power of suspending the operation of an act of the legislature? It would be needless to multiply instances of this kind, to show, how much he differed in many things from Mr. Grenville. If, on the contrary, we compare the doctrines of Junius with those of the Rockingham party, as detailed in the writings of their ablest organ, Mr. Burke, we shall find, that they differ positively on one point only, and, upon another, rather in appearance, than in reality. The first of these relates to the duration of parliaments; the other to the extent of our rights and authority to legislate for the British colonies in America.

But does it so clearly follow, because Burke was the partizan of Lord Rockingham, and Junius the friend of Mr. Grenville, that both writers must be different persons, and that Mr. Burke could not also be a friend to Mr. Grenville? That Mr. Burke, though they frequently differed in opinion, entertained great respect for that gentleman, and had a high opinion of his talents, as a statesman, is well known. If we had no other reason to satisfy us of this (it would be easy to state many proofs of it), it is suffi-

ciently clear from his character of Mr. Grenville, in his speech on American Taxation, which seems to have escaped our author's memory. In the account given there of Mr. Grenville, though he points to some of his defects, it is evident, that Mr. Burke was much more disposed to praise, than to blame him, and that panegyric, accordingly, predominates in the piece.—“ Here (says he) began to dawn the first glimmerings of this new colony system. It appeared more distinctly afterwards, when it was devolved upon a person, to whom, on other accounts, this country owes very great obligations. I do believe, that he had a very serious desire to benefit the public. But, with no small study of the detail, he did not seem to have his view, at least equally, carried to the total circuit of our affairs. He generally considered his objects in lights that were rather too detached.” This want of more extensive views in Mr. Grenville he attributes to his being bred a lawyer; previous to which he remarks:—“ Sir, if such a man fell into errors, it must be from defects not intrinsic: they must be rather sought in the particular habits of his life; which, though they do not alter the ground-work of character, yet tinge it with their own hue.” Junius has no where manifested a more friendly disposition towards Mr. Grenville, or spoken more



highly of his talents and integrity, than Mr. Burke has done, in the following passage. “No man can believe, that, at this time of day, *I mean to lean on the venerable memory of a great man whose loss we deplore in common. Our little party differences have been long ago composed; and I have acted more with him, and certainly with more pleasure with him, than ever I acted against him*\*. Undoubtedly Mr. Grenville was a first-rate figure in this country. With a masculine understanding, and a stout and resolute heart, he had an application undissipated and unwearied†. He took public business, not as a duty which he was to fulfil, but as a pleasure which he was to enjoy; and he seemed to have no delight out of

\* Such are the words of the man, who, it is contended, could not be Junius, because Junius was a friend to Mr. Grenville!

† Mr. Grenville in this particular so much resembled Burke, whose own attention to study and to business was undissipated and unwearied, that it would be natural enough for him, in the character of Junius, to express great respect for Mr. Grenville. Burke must be disposed to praise in another a qualification for which he highly valued himself. Of his own application and industry he speaks thus: “I now appear before you to make trial, whether my earnest endeavours have been so wholly oppressed by the weakness of my abilities, as to be rendered insignificant in the eyes of a great trading city; or whether you chuse to give weight to humble abilities, for the sake of the honest exertions, with which they are accompanied. This is my trial to-day.—My industry is not on trial. Of my industry I am sure, as far as my constitution of mind and body admitted.”

this house, except in such things, as some way related to the business that was to be done within it. If he was ambitious, I will say this for him, his ambition was of a noble and generous strain. It was to raise himself, not by the low, pimping politics of a court, but to win his way to power, through the laborious gradations of public service ; and to secure to himself a well-earned rank in parliament, by a thorough knowledge of its constitution, and a perfect practice in all its business."

If, therefore, we admit, that Junius was ever so friendly to Mr. Grenville, it will be difficult to prove, that he had a better opinion of him, in any respect, than Mr. Burke had ; so that, if we are to make an inference at all, upon the subject, from this source, it will be in favour of the opinion, that Junius was written by Mr. Burke.

But, it may be replied, that Junius, who has never attacked Mr. Grenville in any way, has in one instance at least censured Lord Rockingham, when he says to the Duke of Bedford :—" Apparently united with Mr. Grenville, you waited until Lord Rockingham's feeble administration should dissolve in its own weakness." The censure contained in this passage is not that of a

severe enemy, but rather of the mildest kind; for it could be no great reproach to Lord Rockingham to be told, that he had formed an administration, which was too weak to oppose the power of the favourite. Such a mild censure as this might be expected naturally enough from Burke, if he was Junius, as it was calculated to make the rays of public suspicion take a new course, instead of converging fully upon himself. It is, besides, well known, that Mr. Burke, though, perhaps, he did not think so at first, was afterwards of opinion, that the base of the Rockingham administration was too narrow, and always wished to see a coalition between that party and those of Mr. Grenville and Lord Chatham. It is also worthy of remark, that Junius has not, under that favourite signature, bestowed so high a degree of praise upon Mr. Grenville, as he has upon the Marquis of Rockingham. He praises the shrewd inflexible judgment of the one, and the mild, but determined integrity of the other. "Lord Bute (says he) found no resource of dependence, or security, in the proud, imposing superiority of Lord Chatham's abilities, *the shrewd inflexible judgment* \* *of Mr. Grenville, nor*

\* *The shrewd and inflexible judgment*, which Junius allows to Mr. Grenville, corresponds pretty closely with *the masculine understanding and the stout and resolute heart*, for which he is praised by Mr. Burke.

*in the mild, but determined integrity of Lord Rockingham.*" Nor should it be forgotten, as it shows the respect and friendship of Junius for him, that he reproaches the Duke of Grafton in much severer terms for his desertion of Lord Rockingham, than he did for abandoning his first political patron Lord Chatham:—In his first letter he says, that the Duke's resignation "*was the signal of Lord Rockingham's dismissal.*" He accuses him only of *deserting* and *abandoning* Lord Chatham; but says, that he *betrayed* Lord Rockingham: "Was not Lord Chatham the first who raised him to the rank and post of a minister, and the first whom he *abandoned*? Did he not join with Lord Rockingham *and betray him*?" And again—"Yet you deserted him (Lord Chatham) upon the first hopes that offered of an equal share of power with Lord Rockingham."—And—"Still, however, he was your friend, and you are yet to explain to the world, why you consented to act without him, or why, after uniting with Lord Rockingham, you deserted and *betrayed him*?" It is not necessary to pursue this part of the subject farther.

I believe, that the *variety of most important points*, upon which our author tells us the political systems of Burke and Junius were in direct

opposition to one another, will turn out to be a very limited variety indeed, if it be confined, as I apprehend it is, to two questions, namely, the American stamp act, and the duration of parliament. But, admitting, that they do differ fundamentally on both these points, it is not impossible to assign some reasons, which might induce Mr. Burke to maintain opinions under the signature of Junius, different from those contained in his own writings. I do not say, that these reasons are, or can be satisfactory; they may not, however, be quite devoid of plausibility. Although, upon the whole, Junius is consistent enough with himself in all his letters under that signature, as well as that of Philo-Junius, yet, if we take the whole of his writings, as now given in the new edition, we shall find several inconsistencies. Most of them, however, are not the effects of ignorance, or of a change of opinion, but of design, operating variously at various times, to attain one great object—his own personal security and concealment. Why then may not Burke, when it was so well calculated to answer this end, maintain some opinions under the signature of Junius different from his own? If Junius agreed with Burke in every thing, there would be no difficulty in identifying both; which, by making detection more easy, or increasing the

difficulties, with which his correspondence was attended, would tend to defeat the objects he had in view, and expose him, as he said himself, to the resentment of the worst and most powerful men in the kingdom. Besides the desire of concealment, there are other reasons also, which might be supposed to induce Mr. Burke to maintain opinions under the name of Junius, which he has not held under his own. Might he not do so, in order to secure, or to increase the popularity of Junius; or because it afforded him greater facilities, and better, as well as more frequent, opportunities of attacking those persons, whose characters and measures he most disliked? By declaring in favour of triennial parliaments, he would secure the former; by advocating the stamp act, he was equally sure of the latter advantage.

In all his writings Burke shows, that he was decidedly hostile to parliamentary reform, and to all speculative innovations on the constitution. He was also an enemy to the plans for shortening the duration of parliament. Knowing, as he must have done, that parliamentary reform, and not only triennial, but even annual parliaments had become, at that time, extremely popular throughout the nation, might he not, as Junius,



declare himself in favour of *triennial*, in order to avoid the greater evil of *annual* parliaments, which he knew to be still more popular? Might he not do it to secure the popularity of Junius, and to prevent him from being charged with "an unusual want of political intrepidity?" Might he not do it to give a death blow to the calumnies circulated against him, by some of the most violent of the popular party, and by some of the members of the Bill of Rights Society, who said, that he was an advocate for rotten boroughs and long parliaments? Might he not do it, not merely to please the people, but to hinder himself from being identified with Mr. Burke, which would be unavoidable, were he once to pass for the partizan of the Rockingham party, who, as Mr. Horne has told us, made a formal declaration against short parliaments? Or, might he not also, knowing very well how popular all the opinions of Junius were, and how likely to guide the great body of the people, declare himself in favour of *triennial* parliaments, in the hope that the people, should they adopt his opinion, would abandon not only the pursuit of *annual* ones, which Junius disliked, but perhaps also that of parliamentary reform and innovations on the constitution, which Burke and Junius equally feared and reprobated?—At all events, whatever we may

suppose could have been Mr. Burke's reasons for advocating triennial parliaments under the signature of Junius, or however much we may be at a loss for any satisfactory conjecture on the subject, it is not a little remarkable, that Junius, after a formal declaration of his own opinion, speaks with great mildness, respect, and tenderness of that of the Rockingham party, though so hostile to his own. "Though I have been long convinced (says he) that this (triennial parliaments) is the only possible resource we have left to preserve the substantial freedom of the constitution, *I do not think, that we have a right to determine against the integrity of Lord Rockingham, or his friends. Other measures may undoubtedly be supported in argument, as better adapted to the disorder, or more likely to be obtained.*" (Vol. ii. 311-12.)

With respect to the inconsistency of supposing Burke the author of what has been written by Junius, in favour of the stamp act, it may be remarked, that it afforded him a more plausible and broad ground for attacking various persons, who were constantly wavering between the opinion of George Grenville, for whom, as has been already shown, Burke had a high respect, and that of his best and dearest friend Lord

Rockingham. Such were the Graftons, the Conways, the Townshends, and some of the Bedford party. It also afforded him an excellent pretext for attacking Lord Chatham, to whom he had other reasons of hostility; and whose opinions, respecting the rights of the British parliament to legislate for America, were as different from those of Junius, as they were from those of Mr. Burke. Besides, were Junius to advocate strongly the repeal of the stamp act, that leading measure of the Rockingham party, it would be sufficient to identify him with Mr. Burke, who was considered to be the author of that measure. Nor should it be forgotten, whatever the opinion of Junius was as to the original policy of that act, that Mr. Burke was never more hostile, than he was, to the renewal, or re-agitation of that question, after the repeal. On this point the reader may consult, among others, the following parts of the new edition: (In his *Private Letters to Mr. Wilkes*, vol. i. pp. 293-4, and 329-30. Also p. 55, of the *Public Letters*, *ibid.* See farther vol. ii. pp. 147-8; vol. iii. pp. 159-60, and 168.) The opinion of Junius, in the following passage, corresponds so fully, in all respects, with that of Mr. Burke on the subject of American taxation, that it is strange how it could be overlooked by those, who maintain that

Mr. Burke was not the author of Junius. It occurs in one of his last letters (Nov. 2, 1771,) and has this peculiar circumstance attending it, that it is the last, as well as the fullest and most explicit declaration Junius ever made on the subject. “Junius (says he) considers the right of taxing the colonies, by an act of the British legislature, as *a speculative right merely, never to be exerted, nor ever to be renounced.* To his judgment it appears plain—*That the general reasonings, which were employed against that power, went directly to our whole legislative right, and that one part of it could not be yielded to such arguments, without a virtual surrender of all the rest.*”

But, if, after all, we should allow, that some difference of opinion, upon two points so important, is a very strong argument against Mr. Burke's claims, we ought also to remember, that they agree upon two points of equal importance, and pretty intimately connected with both the preceding; for, if they differ upon the policy of the stamp act, they agree upon the right of the British parliament to legislate for America, in all cases whatsoever; if they differ as to the duration of parliaments, they are equally sanguine and zealous in condemning parliamentary reform, and all innovations on the constitution.

Having now gone fairly through all our author's arguments against Mr. Burke, one only of his remarks to the same effect remains to be noticed. It is more silly and more childish than any thing he has hitherto urged in the way of argument.—“ Why (says he) Mr. Burke was so early and generally suspected of having written them, *it is not easy to say*; but, that he was so suspected is obvious, not only from the opinion at first entertained by Sir William Draper, but from various public accusations, conveyed in different newspapers and pamphlets of the day.” There is not, in my opinion, anything in the world *more easy to say*, than why Mr. Burke was suspected. It was because of all the political characters of the day he was known to be the most learned and the most able writer; and, because the opinions of Junius in the Public Advertiser almost uniformly corresponded with those maintained by Mr. Burke in the House of Commons. Not only Sir William Draper, but by far the greatest part of the opponents of Junius suspected Burke, or charged him directly with the composition of the letters. The Public Advertiser, in the month of October, 1771, contained a letter, signed *Zeno*, which was addressed to “ Junius, alias Edmund, the jesuit of St. Omers.” Another signed *Pliny*, a third, *Querist*,

a fourth, *Oxoniensis*, a fifth, *Scævola*, and several others also appeared, in which Mr. Burke was directly accused of being the author. One of the earliest collections of the letters of Junius was given in an anonymous pamphlet, entitled "The Genuine Letters of Junius, to which are prefixed *anecdotes of the author*." This anecdote writer takes it for granted, that Junius was Mr. Burke, "Thus (says our author) purposely, but fallaciously, identifying the two characters." That his opinion was not quite so erroneous will, I think, be hardly maintained by those, who have attentively examined the contents of this inquiry. *Titus*, another writer in the Public Advertiser, in a letter in defence of Lord Granby, where he talks of "the oratorical powers of a disappointed, dependant politician," insinuates that the letters were written by Burke, whom he considers as dependent on Lord Rockingham, and disappointed by that nobleman's short possession of power. Another writer in the Public Advertiser, who signed himself *an Advocate in the Cause of the People*, also glances at Burke, when he says, that Junius is perhaps one of our discarded ministers, "or rather one of their secretaries, for ministers seldom write so well." *Silurus*, another of the opponents of Junius, suspected Burke: and so did Anti-Malagrida, a writer in defence of the mi-



nistry, who taxes Junius with want of shame, and tells him that “ a blush seldom tinges those happy countenances, which have been bathed in the Liffy.” The last whom I shall mention is *one of the three who bailed Eyre*, after stealing the paper from Guildhall. He tells Junius, from what he can guess of him, that he is worse than either a Scotchman, or an Englishman;” *viz. an Irishman, a liar, and a jesuit.*”

This Inquiry having already extended to a much greater length than I at first expected, or intended, I find myself obliged to pass over altogether a variety of auxiliary topics and illustrations, all tending to confirm and establish my opinion. I mean to touch therefore but slightly even upon those points, to which I shall advert before I conclude.

Junius being the most noted writer of his day, and Burke the best speaker, and, perhaps, the best informed statesman, in the House of Commons, it is remarkable, that they should have been almost altogether silent concerning each other if they were different persons. That general silence, I think, argues strongly for their identity : or if it does not, what could have prevented Junius from attacking Burke on septennial parliaments, or the stamp

act, except this, that the letters were written by Burke himself? It is also remarkable, in the fine passage in one of his speeches, in which Burke noticed Junius, though he glances at his venom, that praise predominates. The whole passage seems to me a most finished and artful panegyric; and reminds me of nothing so strongly, as of the parental fondness of an author performing the office of reviewer to his own work. If he notices defects, it is only with a tender hand, and for fear, that unqualified praise may awaken suspicion and lead to detection; whilst its beauties are touched upon and pourtrayed with a bold and masterly hand. Compared with Junius, how low he makes the North Briton, which he calls "a spiritless though virulent performance; a mere mixture of vinegar and water, at once sour and vapid." Though he notices what he calls his rancour and venom, yet he says, that the letter to the king contains many bold truths, by which a wise prince might profit. The passage altogether is, in my opinion, a most able and judicious panegyric. But the reader shall judge for himself. "Where then (says Mr. Burke), shall we look for the origin of this relaxation of the laws and all government? How comes this Junius to have broken through the cobwebs of the law, and to range uncontrouled, unpunished,

through the land? The myrmidons of the court have been long, and are still, pursuing him in vain. They will not spend their time upon me, or you, or you. No: they disdain such vermin, when the mighty boar of the forest, that has broken through all their toils, is before them. But what will all their efforts avail? No sooner has he wounded one, than he lays down another dead at his feet. For my part, when I saw his attack upon the King, I own my blood ran cold. I thought he had ventured too far, and that there was an end to his triumphs: not that he had not asserted many truths. Yes, sir, there are in that composition many bold truths, by which a wise prince might profit. It was the rancour and venom, with which I was struck. In these respects the North Briton is as much inferior to him, as in strength, wit, and judgment. But, while I expected in this daring flight his final ruin and fall, behold him rising still higher, and coming souse upon both houses of parliament. Yes, he did make you his quarry, and you still bleed from the wounds of his talons. You crouched, and still crouch beneath his rage. Nor has he dreaded the terrors of your brow, sir; he has attacked even you—he has—and, I believe, you have no reason to triumph in the encounter. In short, after carrying away our royal eagle in

his pounces, and dashing him against a rock, he has laid you prostrate. King, lords, and commons, are but the sport of his fury. Were he a member of this house, what might not be expected from his knowledge, his firmness, and his integrity? He would be easily known by his contempt of all danger, by his penetration, by his vigour. Nothing would escape his vigilance and activity. Bad ministers could conceal nothing from his sagacity; nor could promises or threats, induce him to conceal anything from the public\*.”

So extensive were the learning and reading of Mr. Burke, that he was acquainted almost with every department of human knowledge. “He even applied himself (says Bisset) to subjects, which do not very often occupy men of taste and science. He became intimately conversant with the writings of the fathers, and with the subtleties of the school divines; with the principles and details of orthodoxy; the rise, progress, and effects of the manifold heresies; and with the various means either of reason, or of force, employed for their disproof or extirpation.” Those, who

\* Never was there a member of the House of Commons, to whom these concluding observations could be applied with more justice, than to Mr. Burke himself.

are versed in the writings of Junius, must remember some of his allusions to these sources of knowledge. Alluding to the practice in the church of Rome of not commonly giving the cup to the laity, he says of Lord Weymouth, who was fond of the bottle—"Yet he must have bread, my Lord; or rather he must have wine. If you deny him the cup, there will be no keeping him within the pale of the ministry."—"The Bible and Junius, he remarks in another place, will be read, when the commentaries of the jesuits are forgotten." These are the words in which he concludes his answer to Mr. Horne, after remarking immediately before, that the priesthood were accused of misinterpreting the scriptures; but that Mr. Horne had improved upon his profession, as he altered the text and created a refutable doctrine of his own. There are two passages of a similar tendency in the miscellaneous letters. "They figure away, says he, as men of business in the Gazette, yet, by a secret stipulation, are relieved from the trouble of attendance. If *Malagrida* had any interest with the present ministry, I should have no doubt, that this was one of his subtle contrivances. An ostensible engagement, with a mental reservation, is the first principle of the *morale relachée* professed and inculcated by the society of Jesus."

And again, replying to some advocate of the Duke of Grafton, who said, that he was not bound to keep a promise, which he had made, and that in this he could be supported by the soundest casuists—he remarks—“ I am not deeply read in authors of that professed title, but I remember seeing Bassambaum, Suarez, Molina, and a score of other Jesuitical books, burnt at Paris, for their *sound Casuistry*, by the hands of the common hangman. I do not know, that they have yet found their way to England, unless perchance it be to the library of his Grace of Grafton, where they probably stand with the chapter of promises dog-eared down for the perusal of scrupulous statesmen.” The reader will readily find passages of a similar kind, and drawn from the same sources, in all parts of the writings of Mr. Burke.

Junius, from being at first an enemy to Mr. Wilkes, on account of his profligacy and some parts of his public conduct, afterwards espoused his cause, when he found, that the laws and first principles of the constitution had been violated in his person. Burke, who was a very temperate, abstemious, and moral man, could not approve of the private character of Wilkes, any more than



of some parts of his public conduct, which had too great a tendency to excite and inflame the licentiousness of the people, to which Burke was always an enemy. His happy application of a line in Horace, (by adding one letter) to the conduct of the mob when chairing Wilkes, should never be forgotten. “*Fertur (said he) humeris lege solutis.*” Had Burke no other reason to dislike Wilkes, he might think himself justified in doing so from the very unreasonable request, or rather demand, which he asked Burke to make for him from Lord Rockingham, when he came into office. This was nothing less than a general pardon, five thousand pounds in cash, and a pension on the Irish establishment. This message Burke refused to carry; nor could Wilkes prevail upon any body else to make so extravagant an application. To prevent him, however, from being troublesome, the Rockingham party granted him a pension out of their respective salaries, and prevailed on him to return to the continent. Mr. Burke, in his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*, speaks of the immoral character of Wilkes just as Junius does. He was also the great supporter of his cause in the House of Commons; and as anxious, as Junius ever was, for erasing from the journals the decision of

the house on the Middlesex election; which afterwards took place, when the Rockingham party came a second time into office.

Every reader of Junius remembers, with what an unrelenting severity he has attacked the Scotch in all parts of his writings. It is needless to go into any detail of his motives here; but it cannot be irrelevant to show, that Mr. Burke also spoke of them sometimes with no greater respect. This will be evident from a passage in a letter from him to Thomas Burgh, Esq. in 1780. "To this influence, (the overbearing influence of the crown) the principle of action, the principle of policy, and the principle of union of the present minority are opposed. These principles of the opposition are the only thing, which preserves a single symptom of life in the nation. That opposition is composed of the far greater part of the independent property and independent rank of the kingdom; of whatever is most untainted in character, and of whatever ability remains unextinguished in the people, and of all which tends to draw the attention of foreign countries upon this. It is now in its final and conclusive struggle. It has to struggle against a force, to which, I am afraid, it is not equal. *The whole kingdom of Scotland ranges with the venal, the unprincipled,*

*and the wrong-principled of this ; and, if the kingdom of Ireland thinks proper to pass into the same camp, we shall certainly be obliged to quit the field."* Such a passage as this requires no commentary.

Junius entertained as little respect, if possible, for the profession of the law, as he did for the Scotch nation ; and although Mr. Burke does not condemn lawyers in the gross, like Junius, nor could he, indeed, without incurring much odium, or with any degree of decorum, considering, that he had many intimate friends of that profession ; yet it is clear, from several parts of his works, that he had but little respect for lawyers in general. The study of the law, he thinks, does not at all tend to enlarge and liberalise the mind ; and the reader will remember, that the defects in Mr. Grenville's mental character, and his want of extensive views, are ascribed by Mr. Burke to his being bred in that profession. In his speech on conciliation with America, he says—"That when great honours and great emoluments do not win over this knowledge (that of lawyers) to the service of the state, it is a formidable adversary to government. If the spirit be not tamed and broken, by these happy methods, is stubborn and litigious." Nor does he speak of lawyers.

with greater respect in other parts of the same speech. (See Works, vol. iii. pp. 75 and 177.) He is of opinion, that the members of the House of Commons, by not being lawyers by profession, are thereby better fitted to superintend the doctrines and the proceedings of the law courts. "I have always understood, that a superintendence over the doctrines, as well as the proceedings, of the courts of justice, was a principal object of the constitution of this House; that you were to watch at once over the lawyer and the law; that there should be an orthodox faith as well as good works: and I have always looked with a degree of reverence and admiration on this mode of superintendence. *For, being totally disengaged from the detail of juridical practice, we come something, perhaps, the better qualified, and certainly much the better disposed, to assert the genuine principle of the laws; in which we can, as a body, have no other than an enlarged and a public interest. We have no common cause of a professional attachment, or professional emulations to bias our minds; we have no foregone opinions, which, from obstinacy and false point of honour, we think ourselves, at all events, obliged to support. So that, with our minds perfectly disengaged from the exercise, we may superintend the execution of the national justice; which, from this circumstance,*

*is better secured to the people, than it can be in any other country under heaven."* (Works, vol. x. p. 109.)

Those who remember the bitter, the violent and coarse invectives of Junius, may be able to trace the same spirit in Mr. Burke's attack upon the Duke of Bedford, and in his violent and incessant philippics against the authors of the French Revolution. It is unnecessary to illustrate this by examples.

Though Junius was evidently a friend to Ireland, and though the wretched mode, in which that country was governed, afforded him exhaustless sources of attack against the ministry, it is not a little remarkable, that he never enters upon the affairs of that kingdom at large, but only touches upon them incidentally. When, however, he touches upon them it is clear, that he does so with all the warmth and sincerity of a sanguine friend. It strikes me, as in the highest degree probable, that the motive of Junius for abstaining so generally from the affairs of Ireland, was an apprehension, if he entered upon them often and fully, that this circumstance would go far towards a discovery, by strongly identifying him with Mr. Burke.

The new Editor infers from the following passage in one of the private letters of Junius to Mr. Woodfall, that he could not be much less than fifty years of age. “After *long experience of the world*,” says he, “I affirm before God, I never knew a rogue, who was not unhappy.” There is another passage of a similar tendency in one of his letters to Mr. Wilkes, written about the same time, (towards the end of the year 1771) where he says—“Many thanks for your obliging offer; but, alas! my age and figure would do but little credit to my partner.” Junius, to prevent suspicion, may, as in this last passage, pretend, that he was older than he really was; but it does not follow from the former, that he could not be much less than fifty. Mr. Burke, at that time, was just forty-one years old; and when we consider his penetration, sagacity, talent for observation, and the great knowledge of the world, which he is well known to have possessed at that time, after having mixed for about twenty years in London with all classes of people, we shall not be at all surprised to find him mentioning his long experience of the world at an age, when we must be satisfied he knew more of it, than most men do at the end of the longest life.

There is another respect in which Burke’s situa-



tion corresponds exactly to that of Junius. Whoever Junius was, it is clear, that he must have resided almost constantly in London, or in its vicinity, during the time of his correspondence with Mr. Woodfall. This will be evident from an examination of the dates of his letters. His last *Junius* appeared on the 21st of Jan: 1772; and the last of all his letters in the Public Advertiser, under the signature of Nemesis, was on the 12th of May of the same year. Between the 21st of Jan. and the 12th of May, 1772, he wrote eleven private letters to Mr. Woodfall. After that date it is not known, that he ever wrote to him more than once, and that was on the 19th of January, 1773, after a silence of more than eight months. If any letters passed between them afterwards, all traces of the correspondence are lost. His letters, signed *Junius*, took up exactly a period of three years; all his public letters, under this and various other signatures, somewhat more than five. Now what serves in a particular manner to identify Burke with Junius is, that during the time the latter wrote, the former resided (with the exception of a few short visits into the country) constantly in London, or in its vicinity. And it is not a little remarkable, though hitherto unnoticed, that Burke went over to France in the summer of 1772, immediately

after Junius ceased to write in the *Public Advertiser*. It was after his return, that he took occasion, in the House of Commons, in the beginning of 1773, when a bill for the relief of Protestant Dissenters was under discussion, to point out, to the attention and vigilant jealousy of parliament, those plans for the subversion of all order, religion, and government, which, even at that time, he perceived to be rapidly hastening towards maturity in France.

From some of the private letters of Junius (see No. 29) it appears, that so great was his anxiety at one time to have both houses of parliament open to the public, that he sent anonymous paragraphs to the *Public Advertiser* for that purpose, on two successive days, previous to the discussion on the business of Falkland Island. Mr. Burke, on a subsequent occasion, shows a similar anxiety, in a letter to the Marquis of Rockingham in 1777. "There is one thing in particular," says he, "I wish to recommend to your Lordship's consideration; that is, the opening of the doors of the House of Commons. Without this, I am clearly convinced it will be in the power of ministry to make our opposition appear without doors just in what light they

please. To obtain a gallery is the easiest thing in the world, if we are satisfied to cultivate the esteem of our adversaries, by the resolution and energy, with which we act against them: but, if their satisfaction and good humour be any part of our object, the attempt, I admit, is idle." (Works, vol. ix. p. 170.) These coincidences, trifling as they may appear to some, will, however, as they certainly ought, have much weight with others. It is for this reason that I am induced to mention both the following.

Every body, who has read the letters, remembers with what extraordinary severity Junius has sometimes attacked the King. Burke too could sometimes talk with very little respect of majesty, and make it *a mere jest*. Talking one day to Dr. Beattie, who, it seems, was running into much panegyric on the subject, Burke asked him what was *majesty*, if it were stripped of its exteriors, (the first and last letters of the word) but *a jest*?

Burke, though a temperate man, was very sociable, and liked to sit over a bottle of wine with his friends. He preferred light wines, particularly *claret*, and seldom exceeded a bottle.

One evening at the club, when Johnson remarked, "If you make me Dictator you shall have no more wine."—"Then, sir," replied Burke, "you shall not have me for your Master of the Horse." Junius, too, was no enemy either to wine, or to sociability, as will appear from the following passage in one of his letters to Mr. Wilkes, which I think is equally honourable to his heart and his understanding: "The domestic society you speak of (that of Miss Wilkes) is much to be envied. I fancy I should like it still better than you do\*. I too am no enemy to good fellowship, and have often cursed that canting parson (Mr. Horne) for wishing to deny you your claret. It is for *him*, and men like *him*, to beware of intoxication. Though I do not place the little pleasures of life in competition with the glorious business of instructing and directing the people, yet I see no reason, why a wise man may not unite the public virtues of Cato, with the indulgence of Epicurus."

If any person, well acquainted with the writings of Junius, will take the trouble of comparing them with some of the fragments of speeches

\* No man was more domestic, or more happy in his own family, than Mr. Burke.

lately published in the tenth volume of Mr. Burke's works, he will, I am persuaded, be satisfied, that both were the productions of the same author. I decline examples, in order to avoid prolixity.

Bisset, in the parallel, which he has drawn of the eloquence of Cicero and of Burke, justly remarks, that "in the imagery, as well as in the arguments, of Cicero, an attentive reader will find more of rhetorical art, than in Burke's. Cicero deals more in antithesis, climax, interrogation, the productions of study; Burke, in metaphor, personification, apostrophe, the effusions of genius." The latter, too, are the species of figures most common in Junius; so that even in this respect he coincides with Mr. Burke; the ornaments used by both being rather the effusions of genius, than the laboured productions of rhetorical art. Nor is it merely in drawing their imagery from the same sources, that Burke and Junius coincide. They also agree in another particular; for both are frequently hurried by the force and rapidity of genius into a mixture of plain and figurative language, and a confusion of metaphors, which, it has been remarked, a slower mind, with an ordinary recollection of

common-place precepts, would have avoided. "With what countenance can you (says Junius to the Duke of Grafton) take your seat at the Treasury Board, or in Council, when you feel, that every *circulating* WHISPER is at your expense, and STABS you to the heart?" "Thus," says Burke, "are blown away *the insect race of courtly falsehoods*. Thus perish the *miserable inventions* of the wretched *runners* of a wretched cause, which they *have fly-blown* into every weak and rotten part of the country, in vain hope, that, when their maggots had taken wing, their importunate buzzing might sound something like the public voice."

It was my intention in this part of my Inquiry to prove, by a variety of expressions taken from the letters, that Junius must have been an Irishman; and then to show, by a large selection of expressions, some of them identical, others analogous and similar, taken from the writings of both, that the letters of Junius must have been written by Mr. Burke. To avoid prolixity I shall illustrate the former point by one, and the latter only by a few examples. Junius, speaking to Lord North of Colonel Luttrell, says—"I protest, my Lord, there is in this young man's



conduct a strain of prostitution, which, for its singularity, I cannot but admire. He has discovered a new line in the human character; *he has degraded even the name of Luttrell*, and gratified his father's most sanguine expectations." In the words—" *he has degraded even the name of Luttrell*"—there is an allusion, which no Englishman understands, and a severity, therefore, which he cannot perceive. The name of *Luttrell*, in several parts of Ireland, is synonymous with the words *traitor*, or *betrayed*, owing to a tradition, which prevails there among the people, that it was on account of the treachery of an officer of the name of Luttrell, and of the same family, that King James lost the battle of the Boyne. Without such an explanation as this, the words of Junius are unintelligible: and as it was not possible for him to become acquainted with this traditional fact, or with the proverbial use of the word *Luttrell* in some parts of Ireland to signify a traitor, from any written or printed publication, it is clear, that he must have been an Irishman.

If the reader will turn back to pages 84, 5, of this Inquiry, he will find one example of the use of the same mode of expression both by Burke

and Junius; and although there is no species of proof, of which it would be easier for me to give numerous examples, a few must suffice for the present. "This cur, (says Junius, vol. ii. p. 490) *plays fast and loose*, just as I bid him." "They put statesmen and magistrates," says Burke, "into *an habit of playing fast and loose* with the laws." (Vol. x. p. 27.) *To open himself* upon a topic, or *to lay it open*, was a favourite expression with Mr. Burke. "It is worth while *to lay this affair a little more open*." (Junius, vol. iii. p. 14.) "You had all that matter *fully opened* at your bar." (Burke, vol. iii. p. 45.) "Which it will not be amiss *to lay open* somewhat more largely." (Ib. p. 49.) "Permit me *to open myself* a little on this subject." (Ib. p. 145.) In his speech on American taxation, he says—"I shall, therefore, *open myself fully* on that important and delicate subject." "I see no medium between such a temporary accommodation and either the miseries of civil bloodshed, or *the established tranquillity of servitude*." (Junius, vol. iii. p. 274.) Burke has "*the dismal, cold, dead uniformity of servitude*." (Vol. iii. p. 70.) Similar also is the phrase *to sink into the dead repose of despotism*," at the end of his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*. "*I feel warmly on this sub-*

ject," says Burke, "*and I express myself as I feel.*" (Vol. iii. 195.) "*This is the language of my heart,*" says Junius, "*it comes home to us all.*" "Whether those measures are supported openly by the power of government, *or masked under the forms of a court of justice.*" (Junius, vol. i. p. 60.) "*The act,*" says Mr. Burke, "*prepares a sort of masked proceeding, not honourable to the justice of the kingdom, and by no means necessary for its safety.*" (Vol. iii. p. 138.) Alluding to a project of the ministry, that the crown should make no more grants of land in America, Burke talks of "*this avarice of desolation, and this hoarding of a royal wilderness.*" (Vol. iii. p. 63.) Junius, speaking of the conduct of the ministry relative to the *Nullum Tempus Act*, says: "It seems that they *had hoarded up those unmeaning powers of the crown,*" &c. (Vol. iii. p. 16.) Burke shows his powers of invention frequently, by the use of new combinations of language; so does Junius: "My little share in this great deliberation oppressed me." (Burke, vol. iii. p. 26.) "I now appear before you to make trial, whether my earnest endeavours have been so wholly *oppressed by the weakness of my abilities,* as to be rendered insignificant in the eyes of a great trading city." (Ib. p. 8.) Speaking of the

desire of some of those, who formed Mr. Pitt's coalition administration, in 1766, to get rid of him, he says: "The other party \*\*\* seemed rather pleased to get rid of *so oppressive a support.*" The following examples from Junius are of a similar nature: "Our warmest patriots would disclaim me *as a burthen to their honest ambition.*" (Vol. ii. 206.) "The house list of directors *was cursed with the concurrence of government;* and even the miserable Dingley could not escape *the misfortune of your Grace's protection.*" (Vol. i. p. 117.) "Far from regretting *your retreat,* they assure us very gravely, *that it increases the strength of the ministry.* According to this way of reasoning, they will probably grow stronger and more flourishing, every hour they exist; for, I think, there is hardly a day passes, in which some one, or other, of his Majesty's servants does not leave them *to improve by the loss of his assistance.*" (Vol. ii. p. 104.) Mr. Burke remarks in the same spirit—"On the principle of this argument, *the more mischiefs we suffer from any administration, the more our trust in it is to be confirmed.*"—*Be assured,—rest assured,—assuredly,—most assuredly,—depend upon it,—I doubt much,—in my poor opinion,—my poor sentiments,—my poor understanding,—I am a plain man, &c. &c. are*

forms of expression, which are frequently used both by Burke and Junius. The verb *to propose* is uniformly and improperly used by both instead of *to purpose*: "The use *proposed* to be made of it," says Junius, "will be the subject of my next paper." He should have said *purposed*, that is *intended*. "I do not (says Burke) *open them* here, *proposing* only to give the reader some taste of the difficulties, that attend all capital changes in the constitution." "For the purpose of counter-acting the benefits *proposed* by the repeal of one penal law." And again: "If the wealth of the nation be the cause of its turbulence, I imagine *it is not proposed* to introduce poverty as a constable to keep the peace." As neither of them ever departs from this usage, further examples are unnecessary. Junius uses the words, "*whatever is substantial and beneficial in a trial by jury:*" "By this act, (says Burke) so construed and so applied, *almost all that is substantial and beneficial in a trial by jury* is taken away from the subject in the colonies." (Vol. iii. p. 139) It is needless to prosecute this topic farther.

The motto of Junius, "*Stat nominis umbra,*" has been frequently the subject of remark among all those, who have been anxious for the discovery

of this mysterious writer; and trifling as some may think any argument drawn from such a source, it is certain, that even this tends to identify Junius with Mr. Burke. It has been often doubted, whether this motto was a quotation, or the composition of Junius himself. And I know, that the question has been put to many, among others, to two of the first classical scholars this country has produced, without their being able to determine, whether it was original, or a quotation. They did not recollect having ever seen the passage any where but in Junius; and in justice to them it is but fair to say, though it occurs in the first book of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, that it has but very seldom indeed been the subject of quotation. Lucan, though he did not admire the whole of his poem, was a favourite with Mr. Burke; and I think it serves very strongly to identify him with Junius, that, with the exception of Junius, Mr. Burke is perhaps the only English writer, by whom this passage has been quoted in the eighteenth century. It occurs in a speech, which he made on the 11th of May, 1792, occasioned by a petition presented by the Unitarians, and is quoted at full length. (*Works*, vol. x. p. 56.)



“Nec cōiere pares : alter vergentibus annis  
 In senium, longoque togæ tranquillior usu,  
 Dedidicit jam pace ducem :—  
 Nec reparare novas vires, multumque priori  
 Credere fortunæ. *Stat magni nominis umbra* \*.”

We have already seen, that Burke was the author of Junius, in the opinion of most of this writer's opponents, as well as in those of Sir William Draper and Doctor Johnson. Mr. William Gerard Hamilton, we know, was at one time much suspected for being Junius, on account of a conversation between him and the Duke of Richmond : but we are informed by Mr. Malone, in his Preface to Mr. Hamilton's *Parliamentary Logic*, that Mr. Hamilton solemnly declared, near the time of his death, that he was not Junius. On the question, “*who was the author*,” Mr. Malone tells us, that Mr. Hamilton “was as free to talk as any other person, and often did express his opinion concerning it to the writer of this short memoir ;” “an opinion (adds Mr. Malone) nearly coinciding with that of those persons, who appear to have had the best means of information on the subject.” I am happy to have it in my power to declare, that, in Mr. Hamilton's opinion, Burke was the author of Ju-

\* Lucan, l. 129 to 135.

nus\*. This, too, I may add, was also the opinion of Mr. Malone. ✱

Many suspected, that the late Mr. Horne Tooke knew who was the author of Junius. He has been often known to declare, that he knew him, and occasionally talked in an ambiguous way, as if he wished his hearers to think, that he was the author himself. This is, accordingly, the opinion, which some of them entertain; but it is so improbable and absurd, as to merit no attention. I should be sorry to find so very learned a man, as Mr. Tooke, play so very unworthy a part; but it would appear, from the account of his biographer, Mr. Stephens, that he kept up this farce to the last. Mr. Stephens says, that Mr. Tooke often told him he knew who Junius was: he even informs us, that, a short time before his death, he told another friend, that Junius was still alive.

I have so great a respect for the undoubted talents and learning of Mr. Tooke, that I should be sorry to record any thing disgraceful to his

\* Hamilton having one day declared his opinion, that Burke was Junius, it was remarked, that Burke's style was quite different. Mr. Hamilton replied—"Burke's style, sir, is any style."

Malone, remarking - "This observation (the accomplished Fradshaw) may also serve clearly to shew, that another great orator & statesman, Mr. Tooke, whose talents were equal to much higher productions, but who was no favourer of regicides, was not himself the author of the Letters." *Parliamentary Logic*. Preface XXXIII.

memory, did not truth and impartiality require it. It gives me, therefore, greater pleasure to mention the following anecdote, which I have heard on this subject, as much more creditable to his sagacity and abilities. One of Mr. Tooke's acquaintances, a few years ago, took it into his head, that the letters of Junius were written by Gibbon, the historian. After meditating upon the matter for a few weeks, and becoming completely enamoured of his opinion, he called upon Horne Tooke to hear what he would say on the subject. Mr. Tooke, I have been informed, after laughing heartily at the new discovery, told him, that the Letters of Junius were written by nobody, if they were not written by Mr. Burke.

Blackstone, who was certainly one of the best informed men, as well as one of the best literary judges of his time, thought, that Burke was the author. This may be inferred even, were it not otherwise known, from a postscript of his in reply to Junius, where, after stating—"That the person was incapable of being elected, that his election was, therefore, null and void, and that his competitor ought to have been returned," he adds: 'No, says *a great orator*.' Though he was answering Junius he hinted, by this expression, that he suspected him to be Mr. Burke, who

was the great orator here alluded to. Blackstone also upon another occasion alluded even more strongly to Mr. Burke; for in replying to Junius, he directly adverts to some words used by Burke in the House of Commons. Burke, alluding to the Middlesex election, asks:—"By what rule then does the majority of this House square its conduct, when it acts in direct opposition to the majority of the people? *By that rule of arithmetic, which, by its almighty fiat, overturned the laws of nature, decreed 296 to be greater than 1146, and gave us Colonel Luttrell for John Wilkes, a cuckoo in a magpie's nest to suck its eggs.*" The passage, in which Blackstone adverts to this, in one of his replies to Junius, is the following: "Nor is this rule, founded as it is in sound sense and public necessity, to be put out of countenance *by a little ingenious sophistry, playing upon the ambiguity of certain undefined terms, taunting us with the reproach of elections by a minority, of inverting the rules of arithmetic, and the like.*" Expressions which clearly show that, in his opinion, Junius was the same person with Mr. Burke.

Mr. Burke's surviving friends and relatives, thinking him, no doubt, from the great merits

of his acknowledged works, sufficiently rich in literary reputation, have been, on that account, less anxious to claim for him the additional honour of being the author of Junius: on the contrary, they have shewn a far greater anxiety, and have exerted themselves with considerable industry, to discredit whatever tended to countenance such an opinion. Had they remained apparently indifferent or less active than they have been, and allowed every body to form his opinion on the subject from whatever documents were to be procured, the secret, which they seem so anxious to conceal, would be certainly better kept; but, by their overdone anxiety for concealment, they have produced an effect contrary to what they intended; for, instead of putting suspicion to rest, they have given it new life, and vigour, and motion. On account of my respect for the parties, I am unwilling to publish all, that has been communicated to me on the subject: but truth and impartiality make it necessary for me to take some notice of what passed at a meeting held at Mr. Woodfall's, in the beginning of last year, for the purpose of examining the manuscript papers of Junius. Besides other gentlemen, there were also present at this meeting two of Mr. Burke's executors, and the late Mr. Malone.

Two of these gentlemen were so short-sighted as to be unable to distinguish one hand writing from another ; and a third, it seems, was unwilling ; for after barely glancing at one of the manuscripts, he said, it was not the hand of any of the Burke family. This gentleman, I am told, appeared as if he came prepared, at all hazards, to deny that Burke was Junius. He manifested evident uneasiness on the subject, and remarked to one of the gentlemen present—  
*“ Besides, sir, were it true, that he was the writer, it would be cowardly now to publish what dared not be acknowledged in the author’s lifetime ; it would be base.”* Though one of the party promised to bring specimens of the hand writing of all the members of Mr. Burke’s family to the meeting, for the purpose of comparing them with the manuscripts of Junius—none were produced.

Mr. Burke’s executors admitted, that the letters in the Public Advertiser, with the private signature *C*, were *presumptions*, that he was the author, but *not proofs*. I am surprised, that even so much could be admitted by persons, who were of opinion, that it would be base and cowardly to reveal what had not been revealed by the author himself. After such a declaration,



nobody, surely, can be foolish enough to expect, whatever knowledge, or documents they may possess, that these gentlemen will ever condescend to throw any new light upon this interesting and long agitated subject.

Before I conclude, I may take the liberty of mentioning one fact more relative to this subject. During the time that the letters appeared in the Public Advertiser, Mr. Burke's son was a scholar at Westminster school; *and it is remembered by some of those, who were at Westminster school, at the same time, that his private tutor was sometimes able to tell, before hand, when a Junius was to appear.* I think I may add, that this fact is still in the recollection of Dr. Vincent, the very learned and respectable Dean of Westminster.

My readers have now before them all the reasons, which it is my intention to submit to them at present, in support of my opinion concerning the author of Junius. Though they may not appear convincing to all, I flatter myself that most of my readers will allow them to be strong, clear, and satisfactory. This, at least, I think, I have a right to expect from candid scholars, who must be well aware, from the

author's studious desire of concealment, that a question of this kind does not admit of being as rigorously demonstrated, as a question in mathematics. Not being in possession of any private documents, which, if there are any in existence, are deposited in the hands of friends, who are as anxious to keep them secret, as the author was himself, I have been obliged to draw most of my arguments, not from private sources, but from documents already before the public. As every thing was not to be expected from these, if I have satisfactorily proved all they were calculated to enable me to do, and proved it, too, in a way, which it will be difficult, if not impossible, to refute, I think I have done as much as could be fairly expected, and may say—

“ *Est aliquod prodire tenus, si non datus ultra.*”

I think I may go even farther, and say, if I have succeeded, as I hope I have done, in establishing a truth, which has hitherto eluded the anxious and unwearied researches of others, that I have, at least, done some service to the cause of literature. The late learned and celebrated doctor Pitcairne concluded one of his medical dissertations, in which, after all, he proves nothing, in these boasting words:—*Itaque affirmo, me solvisse nobile problema, quod est, dato morbo, invenire remedium; jamque opus exegi.*” Though my

problem is interesting, I cannot, like the doctor, call it (*nobile problema*) a noble one; nor am I disposed to boast, as he has done, though I may do so with more truth, and far a better grace, that I have given a solution of mine, in every respect complete. I may, however, without exposing myself to the imputation of vanity, say, that I have slurred over no difficulties, and that all my exertions, whether weak, or forcible, have been fairly directed, not to cut the gordian knot, but to untie it.

27th June, 1813.













LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 661 501 1